



**DELHI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY**

DELHI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Cl. No. 0:2364:90M194 H2

Ac. No. 40583

Date of release for loan.

28 MAR. 1963

This book should be returned on or before the date last stamped below. An overdue charge of 0.6 nP. will be charged for each day the book is kept overtime.

THE
EDITORIAL PROBLEM
IN SHAKESPEARE

A SURVEY OF
THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE TEXT

BY

W. W. GREG

HONORARY FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

*The Clark Lectures
Trinity College, Cambridge
Lent Term, 1939*

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
1942

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
AMEN HOUSE, E.C. 4
London Edinburgh Glasgow New York
Toronto Melbourne Capetown Bombay
Calcutta Madras
HUMPHREY MILFORD
PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

PREFACE

THESE lectures were not written with a view to printing and it is with some hesitation that they are now offered to a wider public than was originally contemplated. It is possible however that they may possess some permanent interest as an attempt to sum up the present state of critical opinion regarding the foundations of Shakespeare's text. But I ought to make very clear the provisional character of the conclusions presented. In respect of the wider questions at issue I do, indeed, feel some confidence that we have now reached a just estimation of the documents before us, but no corresponding certainty can be claimed for the detailed criticism of individual texts. Moreover, my own personal acquaintance with these texts varies greatly, and the special investigation I was able to devote to them in preparing my lectures was strictly limited. Of certain plays I had already made a close study, and regarding these my conclusions may have some original value; for others I had to rely mainly on the investigations of previous critics, checked by such examination of the texts as I was able to make as I went along. If, however, the reader will kindly bear in mind the tentative nature of all opinions expressed in this volume, it should do no great harm and may even prove of some use. My indebtedness to others who have written on the subject will be sufficiently evident in the pages that follow, especially what I owe to Sir Edmund Chambers¹ and Professor Dover Wilson,² and on certain important questions to Dr. A. W. Pollard and Professor Peter Alexander. I should like to mention that I have been much encouraged in the view I have taken of the *Hamlet* problem by the recent success of Dr. G. I. Duthie³ in tackling the first quarto on somewhat similar lines. I have also benefited by certain suggestions

¹ *William Shakespeare, a study of facts and problems*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1930.

² Textual sections in the new Cambridge Shakespeare, edited by him and Sir A. Quiller-Couch, 1921-39, 17 vols. so far published.

³ *The 'Bad' Quarto of 'Hamlet', a critical study*, Cambridge, 1941. The Introduction contains in fifty pages an admirable summary of recent research on Shakespeare's text.

will depend more upon individual judgement in matters of detail than McKerrow's would apparently have done, but where it is in any case impossible to eliminate a large measure of personal opinion, there seems no objection in principle to admitting some extension of it, if thereby it is possible that the author's intent may be more faithfully rendered. At the worst my formulation of the rules takes account of a good deal of recent research that is certainly of considerable interest and may, one hopes, possess some permanent value. I wish to add that on minor matters of editorial practice I should endorse McKerrow's most judicious proposals at almost every point.

September 1942

W. W. G.

CONTENTS

PROLEGOMENA.—ON EDITING SHAKESPEARE	.	vii
I. INTRODUCTION.—THE FOLIO AND THE QUARTOS 'GOOD' AND 'BAD'	I
II. THEATRICAL MANUSCRIPTS	22
III. THE 'BAD' QUARTOS	49
IV. TWO DOUBTFUL QUARTOS	77
V. THE 'GOOD' QUARTOS	102
VI. THE FIRST FOLIO	131
APPENDIX OF STAGE DIRECTIONS	158.	ADDENDA 182
SUMMARY	183. TABLE . 188.	INDEX . 191

PROLEGOMENA.—ON EDITING SHAKESPEARE

THE problems that confront an editor of Shakespeare are, I imagine, as varied and complex as any encountered in connexion with other great authors of the world. The difficulties arise from two main causes, the diversity of the channels through which his plays appear to have been transmitted, and the conditions under which they were originally composed.

The traditional picture of the depraved state in which Shakespeare's text is alleged to have reached us, the picture so colourfully painted for instance in Johnson's *Proposals* of 1756,¹ has been profoundly modified by recent criticism, which has given us grounds for the contrary belief that the text of the plays contained in the early editions, though no doubt corrupted in one way and another, is nevertheless in most cases of very respectable and even high authority. Indeed it is now a common opinion that in many instances the manuscripts from which the plays were originally printed were either Shakespeare's own autograph papers or the authorized prompt-books that had been prepared from them in the theatre: it has even been thought to identify the two classes and so secure as it were a double measure of authority, though that is a much more hazardous supposition, which appears to me in most cases unlikely.

This is cheering, for whether or not the claim has occasionally been over-confident—and if there are deductions to be made at some points there may be additions to be made at others—I believe that there can be no doubt of its essential validity. At the same time it will not do to conclude that the manuscripts from which the plays were printed were uniform in character, or that the same high degree of authority can be postulated in every case and for every detail. The reverse is true, though happily the number of plays that distinguish themselves by texts manifestly inferior is very small. Of the accepted canon, one play, *Pericles* (which is not in the collection of 1623), has reached us only in a sur-

¹ See below, p. 18.

reptitious edition containing what may be a shorthand report; another, *Macbeth*, has pretty certainly not survived in its original shape, but in what seems to be a rather mutilated stage adaptation; it has been suggested that the disjointed state of a third, *Timon*, is due to its being unfinished and printed from what was in parts no more than a rough draft—in which case its unsatisfactory condition must be set down to circumstances of composition rather than transmission. But even with the great majority of the plays, whose texts appear to be derived from generally reliable manuscripts, the diverse character of these—author's drafts, prompt-books, transcripts—makes the problems they raise often different from one another. There are also several pieces that have reached us in two distinct versions, more or less divergent—more so in those that first appeared in what are generally called 'bad' quartos, less so in others such as *Lear*, *Hamlet* (Q₂ and F), *Othello*—which present a series of peculiarly intricate problems of their own.

So much for transmission: there remain the difficulties arising from the circumstances of composition. Shakespeare's plays were written in the first place for acting. I do not think that Shakespeare, in his later days at least, wrote for the stage only: the length of some of his pieces, which must always have interfered with their being performed in their entirety, suggests that he had some sort of publication in mind. But in his earlier days particularly it is the conditions of the theatre that appear to have determined the manner of his composition, and this seems indeed to have remained generally unaltered so long as he continued to be actively connected with the stage—it may be possible to trace a change of method in his latest work. These theatrical conditions led, it is suggested—and it is not entirely a matter of conjecture—to some carelessness of composition; difficulties both of action and of language were apt to be left standing with the knowledge that they could be trusted to straighten themselves out in rehearsal or be remitted to the book-keeper to tidy up. The textual conditions that we perceive more or less clearly adumbrated behind the earliest editions are these: if a play was printed from the author's

original draft—his ‘foul papers’ as they were called in the theatre—we may expect to find in it contradictions and uncertainties of action and unresolved textual tangles; if, on the other hand, a play was printed from a theatrical fair copy, we may indeed expect to find such contradictions and tangles smoothed out, but we have no assurance that this was done by the author himself—at best we may hope that it was done with his approval or at least his acquiescence. It is possible that in one instance (*Hamlet* Q2 and F) we are able to place the two types of text side by side, and are faced with a choice between the roughnesses and inconsequences of the author and the ordered levelling of the book-keeper. Happily for an editor’s peace of mind this is an exceptional case; as a rule we are only presented either with the author’s own manuscript—and if here and there he has left a passage embrangled, it is not for us to impose a meaning of our own upon it—or else with the prompt-book—and if we suspect that we are sometimes listening to the prompter rather than the author, there is obviously nothing we can do about it.

The conclusion to which I am driving is this, that in the case of Shakespeare—and the same applies to the Elizabethan drama generally—we cannot hope to achieve a certainly correct text, not so much on account of the uncertainties of transmission—though they are sometimes serious—as because the author may never have produced a definitive text for us to recover. All textual criticism, I suppose, is in a manner tentative; but the conditions that obtain in Shakespeare’s plays, in spite of the greater confidence warranted by recent research, still appear such as to make our conclusions even more tentative than usual.

Bearing these various uncertainties in mind, I propose to formulate the main principles or rules which I conceive should govern the procedure of an editor of Shakespeare. In this I shall follow so far as possible the lines laid down in McKerrow’s *Prolegomena*,¹ and I shall not hesitate to use his

¹ *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare, a study in editorial method*, by Ronald B. McKerrow. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1939. (For my object in recasting McKerrow’s rules see the preface to the present volume.) It seemed desirable to keep the general lines of McKerrow’s argument, and I believe such a treatment should in fact prove of most practical help to an editor, seeing that the *Prolegomena*

actual words whenever I find it convenient to do so. I shall also discuss the rules in detail, seeking to define more exactly what they imply and the extent of any reservations it may be necessary to make.¹ Both in the rules and in the discussion it is of course with the conditions of Shakespeare's text that I am immediately concerned, but I shall endeavour to give a certain generality to my remarks in order that they may apply so far as possible to the Elizabethan drama as a whole and even to other literature of the time.²

RULE I

*The aim of a critical edition should be to present the text, so far as the available evidence permits, in the form in which we may suppose that it would have stood in a fair copy, made by the author himself, of the work as he finally intended it.*³

A warning is needed in connexion with this rule lest the mention of a fair copy should be thought to justify altera-embodiment the results of actual experience and experiment. At the same time I think that from a theoretical point of view a more fundamental analysis of the critical data is possible, and I should propose the following scheme:

- A. Plays for which there is a single authority, viz. when there is only one edition printed from manuscript, and reprints contain none but accidental or conjectural variants.
- B. Plays for which there is more than one authority:
 - (1) when there are two (or more) editions printed from manuscript;
 - (2) when a reprint has been altered from an independent source:
 - (α) when the alterations affect the general character of the text;
 - (β) when the alterations are only sporadic.

¹ I have done my best to incorporate reservations in the rules themselves, but it is of course only possible to do so in a very general manner. The discussion does not pretend to be exhaustive: it only aims at clarifying the principles involved, not at examining all the details of procedure that crop up in practice. I should also explain that it is in general intended to apply only to the actual text of the plays, that is what was spoken on the stage, not to such adjuncts as stage directions and speakers' names, the treatment of which will necessarily be governed more by considerations of expediency. What is contemplated is a critical edition not a facsimile reprint.

² It is significant that Shakespeare is the only dramatist and almost the only writer of his day for the textual purity of whose works contemporary editors showed any solicitude. A surprising amount of care was devoted to the preparation of the first folio, and the problems it presents to a modern critic are correspondingly complex.

³ 'For scholarly purposes, the ideal text of the works of an early dramatist would be one which . . . should approach as closely as the extant material allows to a fair copy, made by the author himself, of his plays in the form which he intended finally to give them . . . '—*Prolegomena*, p. 6.

tions for which there is in fact no warrant. A fair copy is postulated in order that the original may be supposed to have accurately represented the author's intention, and that all obvious slips may be ascribed to defective transmission. An editor should of course remove so far as possible all errors and imperfections for which there is reason to believe either a scribe or compositor responsible;¹ indeed, he may be allowed to rectify any blunder which it is certain that the author would have recognized as such had it been pointed out to him, provided that neither the nature of the blunder nor the form of the correction is open to doubt. The postulate is not intended to allow the 'correction' of irregular metre or grammar or the removal of inconsistencies that the author overlooked and may indeed have regarded as permissible or insignificant, nor yet of the more definite errors we sometimes find woven into the texture of a play.² Still less of course should it be invoked to justify 'improvements' in the language, pleading that had they been suggested the author would have recognized them as such! It might no doubt be quite truly argued that in a fair copy any textual tangle would have been unravelled; but here the 'available evidence' does not as a rule permit of the difficulty being resolved, and the text, however unsatisfactory, must therefore be allowed to stand, except for example in cases of obvious and simple duplication.³

¹ Always supposing the reason to be a reasonable one. Some editors appear to have believed that whatever did not please them must be corrupt.

² There can be no doubt that Shakespeare occasionally wrote a sentence that does not mean what he intended, though at the time of writing he evidently thought that it did. Sometimes it means the exact opposite: e.g. *Macbeth*, III. vi. 8-10, 'Who cannot want the thought, how monstrous It was . . . To kill their gracious father?' Such a sentence should not be altered—correction indeed is generally impossible short of complete rewriting—any more than should instances of confused construction. They are part of the author's mental make-up. It is also clear that Shakespeare now and then wrote one name by mistake for another, as in *King John*, II. i. 149, where he confused the French King and the Dauphin. Whether such an error can be corrected depends, I think, on circumstances. Names are not as a rule metrically equivalent.

³ In these an editor will have to decide which version represents the author's final intention and abide by that version save for subsequent corruption: he should not conflate the two. It must not, of course, be assumed (where they are not contiguous) that the version found at the correct point in the text is necessarily the final one.

RULE 2

With this aim in view, an editor should select as the basis of his own edition (as his copy-text, that is) the most 'authoritative' of the early prints, this being the one that on critical consideration appears likely to have departed least in wording, spelling, and punctuation from the author's manuscript.¹

In textual criticism generally, the conception of the 'most authoritative' text, though still common, is today somewhat discredited.² Nevertheless, in the case of Shakespeare's plays, as indeed of all works for which we are dependent on printed sources, it remains, so long as its limitations are understood, of value and importance, at least for a general estimate of the textual evidence. The fact appears to be that the notion is strictly valid in all cases (and they are the great majority) in which there is only one line of descent, while in cases in which there are several it remains practically valid so long as one text is admittedly out of comparison better than any other. The only cases in which it is subject to serious limitation are those rare ones in which an editor has to choose between two (or more) independent texts of comparable merit. And even in such cases he is in practice compelled to adopt some one edition as his 'authority', unless he proposes to modernize or at least normalize the spelling and punctuation of the original (cf. p. liii).

It is here assumed, and is implied in the rule, that in a critical edition the spelling and punctuation of the copy-text are to be preserved. I do not propose in this place to discuss the propriety of so doing, but shall assume the reader to be generally familiar with the grounds of modern editorial practice in this respect.³ It is, however, necessary to point

¹ 'The "most authoritative" text [which an editor is to determine and reprint] is . . . that one of the early texts which, on a consideration of their genetic relationship, appears likely to have deviated to the smallest extent in all respects of wording, spelling, and punctuation from the author's manuscript.'—*Prolegomena*, pp. 7-8. The considerations in accordance with which the authority is to be determined will be more conveniently considered under Rules 3 and 4.

² It is, no doubt, true that there is always one edition that is in fact more authoritative, in the sense of being more often correct, than any other. What criticism looks askance at is the conception of a text whose authority is assumed to override all other. ³ I have added a note on the subject at the end (p. 1).

out that, given the above rule, a conflict is conceivable between the essential readings of a text and what may be called the 'accidents' of spelling and punctuation as criteria of authority. In general of course the authority of a text will be determined upon a review of the evidence as a whole, but it is at least theoretically possible that the edition which may be supposed to stand at the least remove from the author's original, and so to preserve most nearly the accidents of the autograph, should yet for one reason or another have seriously corrupted the words. If that is so an editor will have to decide which criterion he intends to apply (cf. p. liv, note 1). It is perhaps hardly an occasion for dogmatism, but I think the following considerations may help towards a decision. If one text was set up directly from the autograph manuscript it may be expected to preserve something of value in respect of the accidental features of the original, while the individual readings, if corrupted, can *ex hypothesi* be recovered from another edition. On the other hand, if no text was set up from the autograph, but all alike depend on transcripts, it matters comparatively little how many of these have intervened, for the link with the author's original in the matter of accidentals will be more remote, and greater weight will therefore attach to the preservation of the words.

RULE 3

In seeking to determine which is the most authoritative edition, an editor should distinguish between 'substantive' editions, namely those not derived as to essential character from any other extant edition, and 'derivative' editions, namely those derived, whether immediately or not and with or without minor intentional modification, from some other extant edition. It may be taken that the most authoritative edition will be a substantive one, but the distinction is in practice sometimes difficult to draw, so that this has less significance than at first appears.¹

¹ 'Consideration of the various early texts . . . will show us . . . that in the case of any play there is at least one edition . . . which cannot have been derived from any other edition now extant . . . and that others of these texts . . . are derived [not necessarily immediately], with or without intentional modification, from earlier extant editions. Let us call the texts of the first group "substantive" texts; those of the second "derived" texts. It is evident that "the most authoritative text" of which we are in search must be a "substantive" one.'—*Prolegomena*, p. 8.

The effect of this rule is generally to exclude from consideration (as copy-text) any reprint of an extant edition. It is obvious that however little faith we may have in the accuracy with which the original compositor reproduced his copy, a reprint (unless reference has been made to some other source) can draw nearer to that copy only through accident or through emendation. But neither chance nor ingenuity is a source of authority. Those readings alone are to be regarded as possessing (traditional) authority which are found in the earliest extant text of any particular line of transmission, not emendations of those readings, however convinced we may be that the emendations are correct.¹

So far an editor's way is clear enough. Yet it is over the distinction between substantive and derivative texts that our first serious difficulty arises. There is an ambiguity latent in the unqualified use of the expression 'derived from'. It would be simple to take it to mean 'printed from' or 'derived by successive printings from'; but if the distinction is to have any real significance—if, for instance, we are to be able to say that the most authoritative edition is always a substantive one—it will be necessary to restrict somewhat the extension of the term. For there are instances in which, in the course of reprinting, an edition has been so much altered by the introduction of readings from another source, that its general character may be more properly said to derive from that source than from the edition actually used as copy. Thus it becomes necessary to recognize an intermediate type of 'mixed' text, which for our purpose it is convenient to regard as substantive. We shall therefore class as substantive, not only those texts that may be called substantive in their own right, each being printed from a manuscript (or being the earliest extant print descended from that manu-

¹ 'I shall use [the term] "authoritative reading" for any reading which may be presumed to derive by direct descent from the manuscript of the author' (*Prolegomena*, p. 12). But this introduces another consideration, namely the relation of the substantive edition or editions to the autograph, which it will be better to keep distinct. All readings of a text that stands at the head of any line of descent share alike in the authority of that text, so that even manifest errors are in a sense authoritative readings, though there may be no ground for presuming them to derive from the author's manuscript.

script), but also those texts of mixed character that, though reprints, have acquired substantive status through a modification of their essential character. As derivative we shall recognize only those reprints of extant editions that are substantially unaltered. Thus, while it is true that every derivative edition is a reprint of some other edition, and that every edition that is not a reprint is substantive, it is not true that every reprint is derivative, or that no substantive edition is a reprint.

From this it will be seen that the distinction is essentially a quantitative one. The introduction into a reprint of sporadic correction or revision will not affect its derivative character; but there comes a point at which the alteration is so extensive that we can no longer regard the general character of the text as unaffected and are driven to allow the edition substantive status. And in like manner the text of an edition printed from manuscript may be contaminated by the influence of some earlier printed edition; for there may of course be several substantive editions of a play each in its own right, though much more often there is only one. It will be necessary to carry our analysis of substantive and derivative texts a little further.

In practice the cases in which the distinction loses some of its clear-cut simplicity are found to fall into two fairly well-marked categories, according to whether the disturbing factor affects the text as a whole or only specific passages in it. I have touched on the first of these already and shall return to it; meanwhile I must say something of the second.

Experience shows that an edition generally printed from manuscript may yet contain passages derived from an extant printed source; while an edition generally printed from another extant edition may yet contain specific original additions. Nevertheless, as a rule the former will not cease to be substantive nor the latter derivative—except of course so far as the exceptional passages are concerned. One or two examples of each will make the position clear.¹

(i) When there are two substantive editions (in their own right) it sometimes happens that the later, though printed

¹ Cf. *Prolegomena*, p. 10, note 1.

in general from a manuscript, contains passages agreeing so exactly with the earlier and for the most part markedly divergent edition, as to lead to the presumption that they were set up from it, probably owing to a defect in the manuscript elsewhere used as copy. Instances are 2 *Henry VI*, iv. v and vi. 1-7 and 3 *Henry VI*, iv. ii. 1-18, and others are perhaps to be found in *Romeo and Juliet*.¹ If the inference is correct, then for these passages there is in fact only one substantive text, that namely of the earlier edition (or the first of its line of descent), but that will not prevent our classing the later edition likewise as substantive.²

(ii) On the other hand, some derivative editions have been supplemented by the introduction of passages from another (non-extant) source. Examples are the 'fly' scene in *Titus Andronicus* (III. ii), which first appeared in the folio of 1623, and the 'deposition' episode in *Richard II* (iv. i. 154-318), which was added in the fourth quarto in 1608, and again, from a better original, in the first folio.³ Such editions are therefore substantive for the additional passages, though their generally derivative character remains unchanged.⁴

It will be noticed that these two cases are in a manner correlative: we could imagine the exceptional passages in

¹ In this play it is uncertain whether a rather ill-defined section of the 'good' Q₂ was in fact printed from the 'bad' Q₁ owing to a defect in the manuscript generally followed, or whether the printer began by using a copy of Q₁ that had been corrected by comparison with the manuscript, which would give the section the character of a mixed text. Again, in the folio version of *Richard III*, which is in general a mixed text (see p. xviii), two sections were printed from a quarto practically without alteration, once more doubtless owing to defects in the manuscript elsewhere used for correction. These sections, therefore, are essentially similar to those in *Henry VI*, although the text in which they occur is not substantive in its own right.

² For the editorial treatment of these exceptional passages see p. xxxvi, note 2.

³ We must add the passages peculiar to the folio text of 2 *Henry IV* if that text was in fact set up from the quarto, which is at present uncertain. The second quarto of *Othello* (1630) contains passages not in the first (1622), but these had already appeared in the folio and were almost certainly taken from that source. Additional passages in mixed texts do not concern us here: they are of course part of the revision. Outside Shakespeare a well-known instance is afforded by the additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* in 1602. The 1616 version of *Doctor Faustus* will have to be classed as a mixed text if, as seems probable, it was actually set up from a much altered copy of an earlier quarto. (The relation of the texts of 1604 and 1616 is one of the unsolved problems of the Elizabethan drama.)

⁴ For the editorial treatment of the additions see p. xxxviii.

either increased to a point at which it would be difficult to say whether the edition was a substantive one with large derivative elements, or a derivative one with large substantive additions. I may say at once that I am not aware of any texts in which this actually happens—at any rate it does not happen in any of Shakespeare's plays.¹ There the exceptional passages are always subordinate, and the general status of the text remains unaffected.

So much for those cases in which it is the presence of specific passages of an exceptional character that disturbs the simplicity of the distinction we are trying to draw. Let us now return to those in which the texture of the work is affected. When an edition is printed from manuscript there is, I think, only one way in which it can become contaminated throughout from a previously printed text. It seems occasionally to have happened that although the manuscript was not actually defective (as assumed under (i) above) it was here and there sufficiently obscure to present difficulties to the compositor, who thereupon consulted an earlier edition and so reproduced a reading from it in the middle of a passage clearly derived from the manuscript.² Such readings may occur frequently throughout a play, but they remain of course sporadic and in no way affect the character of the text.

It is otherwise when we come to consider the opposite case of a reprint modified from some independent source. The modification may of course be again sporadic, due to casual correction or revision, and the character of the text be once more unchanged. It may, on the other hand, be of an extensive nature, as in the mixed texts already mentioned. And in this case we shall find it necessary to distinguish two types, according as the character of the text has been modi-

¹ The nearest approach is in *Richard III*, the folio text of which is as regards six-sevenths substantive (mixed) and as regards one-seventh derivative.

² It is difficult to find a quite convincing example, since the evidence is as a rule cumulative, but the following comes as near certainty as any that I know. In the 'good' second quarto of *Romeo and Juliet* it is clear, from the combination of corrections and errors, that Mercutio's speech at II. i. 6-21 must have been set up from manuscript. Yet in the midst of it (l. 13) stands the quite senseless reading '*Abraham : Cupid*' (usually supposed to be an error for '*Adam=Cupid*') which agrees exactly (even to the roman colon) with that of the 'bad' first quarto, from which it was presumably copied.

fied through collation with a manuscript,¹ or through being deliberately rewritten. In effect the difference is that in the one type it has been sought to restore a corrupt text to conformity with a pre-existent original, while in the other a good original has undergone subsequent revision.²

(a) First, then, we have the conflated type. The folio text of *Richard III* is now believed to have been printed mainly from the quarto of 1622 with substantial correction, partly from that of 1602 without appreciable correction (so far as the text itself is concerned): the folio text of *King Lear* is believed to have been printed, again with extensive correction, from the first quarto of 1608.³ If, therefore, 'derived from' were to be interpreted as 'printed from', both these folio texts would be derivative. In both, however, the alterations are so extensive, so important, and drawn apparently from so superior a source, as to render the folio texts the more authoritative and to make it necessary to treat them as substantive. Indeed, in these cases the object of the corrector appears to have been to bring the printed copy that he handed to the compositor into complete agreement with some independent manuscript, though his efforts to do so

¹ Always in practice a manuscript. It is true that the second quarto of *Othello* (cf. p. xvi, note 3) was contaminated as well as supplemented from the folio, but the exception is trivial, since the edition is of no authority and the alterations are not extensive.

² The existence of the class of mixed texts is not explicitly recognized in the *Prolegomena* and can hardly have been in McKerrow's mind when he defined 'substantive' and 'derived' editions (see p. xiii, note). That he was aware of the conflated type appears, however, from the note prefixed to the specimen pages from *Richard III* at the end. Furthermore, his remark that 'If we had external evidence that a particular text of any work had been revised throughout by its author, such a text should undoubtedly be made the basis of a modern edition' (*Prolegomena*, p. 14), taken in conjunction with a later reservation, 'unless we could show that the edition in question (or the copy from which it had been printed) had been gone over and corrected throughout by Shakespeare' (*Prolegomena*, pp. 17-18; see below p. xxxvii, note 2), shows that he was also aware of the possibility of the revised type.

³ The relation of these texts has not always been recognized, but I believe the above account to be certainly correct and likely to be now generally admitted. The portions of *Richard III* printed from the quarto of 1602 (roughly the first 160 lines of Act III and the last 360 lines of Act V) are of course purely derivative, and for them there is only one substantive text, namely the first quarto of 1597. They belong in fact to the category of passages already considered under (i), though here occurring in a mixed text.

were not uniformly successful. There may be one or two further instances of the conflated type of mixed text among Shakespeare's plays, but they are more doubtful and over them opinion is likely to differ.¹

(b) The second or revised type is probably not found in Shakespeare's plays, though it is well known elsewhere. It is not altogether unusual for an author to revise his work. If the edition containing the revision was set up from manuscript it will of course be substantive in its own right. But if, as is much more likely, it was set up from a copy of some earlier edition in which the author had entered his alterations, then, provided the revision was made continuously throughout, and especially if there is reason to suppose that the new edition was seen through the press by the author, it will still be right to accord it substantive rank.²

The classical instance of such revision in the Elizabethan drama is that of Ben Jonson's plays in the folio of 1616.³ All had been previously printed,⁴ and in every case the folio text appears to have been actually set up from an earlier quarto, though Jonson is credited with having revised the proofs and may therefore be supposed to have made himself

¹ The only other Shakespearian plays of which we have two texts (other than recognized 'bad' quartos) exhibiting marked differences throughout are *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *Troilus and Cressida*, and *2 Henry IV*. The folio text of *Hamlet* is certainly, and that of *Othello* almost certainly, substantive in its own right: neither, therefore, comes in question here. In *Troilus* it is probable, and in *2 Henry IV* possible, that the folio text was printed from a copy of a quarto that had been altered by comparison with a manuscript and therefore partakes at least to some extent of the character of a mixed text, but it is by no means clear that the alteration was such as to raise the folio to substantive rank, still less that the folio should be regarded as the more authoritative.

² There is of course the possibility that the reviser might not be the original author. This would not of itself affect the question whether the revised text was to be classed as substantive (see p. xxi). An editor concerned with the original author only would pay no attention to the revision. On the other hand an editor who set out to print the revised version would proceed just as if the revision had been the work of the original author. The case, therefore, need not be separately considered.

³ Samuel Daniel, William Alexander, and Fulke Greville all prepared revised versions of some of their plays, but I have not myself studied the textual relationship of the several editions.

⁴ All the plays, as distinct from the masques, with the possible but doubtful exception of *Epicene*, of which no copy of an alleged first quarto dated 1612 is now known.

responsible for whatever departures there are from the text of the earlier editions. It is true that the extent to which the several plays have been altered differs in the extreme. *Every Man in his Humour* underwent so minute and thorough a revision that to represent the differences between the texts in the form of collations would be intolerably cumbrous. But in other plays, such as *Volpone* and *Catiline*, the verbal changes are few, and an editor would more naturally follow the original quartos, were it not for the minute revision of the punctuation and other details apparently found in these pieces as in the others. It is, indeed, rather such detailed supervision than the introduction of textual alterations that justifies our ranking a revised reprint as a substantive edition.¹

Thus it will be seen that it is only in the simplest cases, those of an entirely unaltered reprint and of an edition printed from manuscript without reference to any other source, that the distinction between derivative and substantive texts is perfectly clear cut. Whenever there has been any alteration or contamination of the primary source, we have to inquire how far it has gone and whether the essential character of the text is affected. In practice we find

¹ It might of course happen that the example of the earlier edition used as copy for the later had been revised, not by the hand of the author, but by comparison with the autograph of his revised version or perhaps with a prompt-book representing the same—thus in a manner combining cases (a) and (b). This possibility introduces some complications into the problem—always assuming that the facts could be established. If the original edition was printed from a transcript there may be no objection to recognizing the revised edition as substantive. If, however, the original edition was printed from the autograph of the original version, it will obviously be of greater authority than the later edition in all but the actual readings altered in revision, and it will be desirable to go to considerable length to bring the case under Rule 6, and so still secure the original edition as copy-text.

It should further be observed that in practice it is not possible to keep cases (a) and (b) entirely distinct. In the former it can seldom be certain that the manuscript used for correction had undergone no revision subsequent to the date of the earlier text; in the latter it is always possible that some of the alterations made by the author in the course of revision (or by comparison with his revised manuscript) may be restorations of readings corrupted in the earlier edition. Revision, however, should never be assumed except on cogent grounds, while the detailed relationship of the two versions is in fact mainly of theoretical interest and has little bearing on editorial practice. At the same time it will be well to be on the alert for any indication that a manuscript used for correction had itself been tampered with by an alien hand (cf. p. xli).

that the character of the primary source remains essentially unchanged in all cases except that of a reprint which has assumed a mixed character as a result of either conflation or revision. When the text is truly 'mixed', when, that is, the alteration has gone so far that its essential character has been modified, then the edition will be classed as substantive, and its editorial treatment will be governed by Rules 4 and 5. Should alteration fall short of this, the treatment of the text will come under Rule 6, which applies to 'corrected' editions. But the distinction, being a matter of degree, will not always be easy to draw: opinion may differ, and decision may even at times be governed by considerations of convenience. If an editor decides to treat a mixed text as substantive, it may simply mean that he wishes to use it as his copy-text. But it may not mean this at all. A mixed text need not be more authoritative than its primary source; for there is always on the one hand the possibility of a reprint having been conflated with an inferior manuscript,¹ and on the other that of revision having been carried out by someone other than the author.² In either case the character of the text may be changed to such an extent that it would be proper to treat it as substantive. Actually, however, the question whether a text of this kind is substantive or derivative is purely academic, since there is of course no question of its being used as copy-text, and an editor's attitude towards it will be exactly the same whether he regards it as a substantive edition of inferior authority or as a derivative edition embodying dubious revisions.

That the most authoritative edition will always be a substantive one is true, but the statement loses some of its significance in view of the fact that substantive and derivative texts have been so defined as to make this possible.

RULE 4

The choice between substantive editions, in the event of there

¹ An editor of Shakespeare will have to decide whether this may not have happened in *Troilus and Cressida* and *2 Henry IV*.

² Certain Restoration alterations of earlier plays might be cited. No doubt these are, from the textual point of view, generally negligible; still it is possible that they may occasionally embody fragments of genuine stage tradition.

*being more than one, is a matter for critical judgement of the general authority of the texts, based in the first instance upon a consideration of their probable relationship, character, and derivation.*¹

If there is only one substantive edition of a work it is *ipso facto* the most authoritative and must be made the basis of any modern critical text. It is only in the event of there being more than one substantive edition that an editor has any freedom in the matter.

The choice between substantive texts, though in most cases obvious, may be one of the most delicate tasks that an editor has to perform. To some extent indeed his choice may have already been made, since his decision whether or not to allow a text substantive status will very likely be influenced by the view he takes of its authority. Still the instances in which he has to make this decision are not the only ones that present difficulties, and anyhow a general discussion of the subject seems desirable.

It is suggested (by McKerrow) that an editor should choose on literary grounds the text that on the whole best represents what he supposes the author likely to have written at the date to which he assigns the work in question, and that he should then abide faithfully by the chosen text. My own view is that while it is not possible in the last resort to avoid an appeal to the editor's literary judgement, his choice should so far as possible be determined, and in fact normally is determined, by the theory he has formed of the character and relationship of the manuscripts (or other authorities) used in the preparation of the texts. Moreover, as we shall see later, the theory formed concerning the nature of the sources may seriously modify the extent to which it is reason-

¹ 'Obviously, if a work has been transmitted to us in several [substantive] editions . . . it will, in the absence of any external evidence as to the relationship of the texts, be the duty of an editor to select for the basis of a new edition that text which in his judgement is most representative of the author and most nearly in accord with what, in view of his other works, we should have expected from him at the date to which the work in question is assigned. In the majority of cases this will mean simply that the editor must select the text which appeals most to his critical judgement, and this, in its turn, will as a rule be the one which appears to be the most careful copy of its original and the most free from obvious errors.'—*Prolegomena*, pp. 13-14. But see the next note.

able to rely in detail upon the authority of the chosen text, and therefore the fidelity with which it should be followed. That it is safer to base the selection of the folio in preference to the quarto text of *Richard III* and *King Lear* upon a recognition of the fact that in both the quarto shows evidence of reporting, whereas the folio seems to derive its general character from manuscript tradition, rather than upon any literary judgement of textual probability, will hardly be questioned when it is remembered that some of the ablest editors have in the past often preferred the quarto to the folio readings. If it is argued (as McKerrow might have done) that all theories concerning the manuscript sources of the text are necessarily speculative, I should readily agree; but I should point out in return that there is no reason to suppose them less reliable than literary judgements of what an author is likely to have written at a particular hypothetical point in his career.¹

¹ I very much doubt whether the passage from the *Prolegomena* quoted in the preceding note in fact accurately or adequately represents McKerrow's intention. For one thing, he elsewhere expressly allows inquiry into 'The general character of the copy from which the substantive text (or texts) of a work was set up' (p. 8), though he goes on to give an emphatic and very proper warning against unbridled speculation in this direction. Further, I believe that in making his own choice he was in effect as much guided by conclusions respecting the source and nature of the copy as by any literary judgement of the quality of the text: at any rate, in the note he prefixed to the specimen pages of *Richard III* at the end of the *Prolegomena*, he gave as a reason for regarding the folio text as the more correct, that the quarto was 'almost certainly printed from a "report" and not from a transcript of the author's manuscript'. Nor must we forget that he held that the question which of the early texts was the 'most authoritative' was to be determined 'on a consideration of their genetic relationship' (*Prolegomena*, pp. 7-8; see above, p. xii, note 1), though by this he may merely have intended to exclude derivative editions.

It is also true that in his discussion of the choice between substantive editions he did not *entirely* exclude consideration of the nature of the manuscripts used, since it will be noticed that he prefaced his insistence on editorial judgement with the words 'in the absence of any external evidence as to the relationship of the texts'. Thus he would presumably have regarded the statement on the title-page of the *Hamlet* quarto of 1604-5, 'Newly imprinted and enlarged to almost as much again as it was, according to the true and perfect copy', as justifying its being preferred to the quarto of 1603. But in themselves and unless confirmed by internal evidence (as in the case of *Hamlet*) such statements on title-pages (in practice the only external evidence, in the case of Shakespeare's plays, that we possess) are worthless, and are in fact generally discounted, as for example the wholly unfounded assertion that the 1602 quarto of *Richard III* was 'Newly augmented' (see further p. xliii, note). If, therefore, we interpret strictly what is said in the *Prolegomena*, it would appear that McKerrow, while allowing weight to this external evidence,

What bearing theories respecting the relationship of the sources may have upon the treatment of the copy-text will call for consideration under Rule 5. But before passing on something must be said concerning the different types of relationship to be observed where there are two or more substantive editions of a play.

In several instances two widely different versions can be distinguished, namely in those plays first published in recognized 'bad' quartos, now commonly supposed to be based on stolen reports, texts that stand condemned by any criterion. Somewhat similar are *Richard III* and *King Lear*, which first appeared in what are also apparently reported texts, though of a higher order of accuracy. Moreover, in these the relationship is complicated by the fact of the folio text, divergent as it is, having been actually set up from the quarto; and indeed the choice between the two remained uncertain until the criterion of origin was substituted for that of literary appeal.¹ Next comes a class of plays represented by *Hamlet* and *Othello* (and including 2 *Henry IV* and *Troilus and Cressida* if the folio texts of these can claim substantive status) of each of which we have two editions that appear to be derived (at least substantially) from different manuscripts of comparable authority, and the choice between which is therefore correspondingly difficult.² These

was determined to exclude the far more significant internal evidence from consideration—at least in theory, for as I have said, I do not believe that he adhered to this intention in practice.

¹ There is a certain drawback in taking one of these conflated editions as copy-text, namely that, being basically a reprint, it is in the matter of spelling and so forth at two removes from the manuscript originally used. This cannot be helped, since, when the revision has been extensive, it is impossible to say how far it may have affected the minutiae as well as the essentials of the text. There would, however, in any case be little object in attempting to retain the details of the earlier edition, for the very fact that it was subjected to thorough correction naturally implies that the authority of the copy originally used was slight (cf. the final note, p. lv). The conditions in the case of revision by the author are somewhat different (see p. xx, note).

² The authority is comparable at least in the sense that neither of the manuscripts was of manifestly corrupt character. If critics are correct in supposing the second quarto of *Hamlet* to have been printed from Shakespeare's autograph and the folio text to derive from the prompt-book, then no doubt the quarto is the *more* authoritative, since it would be directly derived from the manuscript which was also the source of the prompt-book. In this case, therefore, the choice seems clear.

are all the Shakespearian plays of which more than one substantive edition could be postulated. But to complete the logical series one further possibility should be mentioned, though I am not aware that any certain instance can be found in the whole range of Elizabethan literature. This is the printing of two distinct editions from the same (unaltered) manuscript.¹ In such a case authority can only depend upon the relative typographical accuracy of the two prints.

It will appear on consideration that, as we progress through the series of types, the nature and origin of the several texts becomes generally less and less important as a criterion for choosing between substantive editions; and though as a rule I deprecate relying on personal judgement of style, I must admit that it becomes increasingly necessary. In the final case we can only ground our choice upon our impression of the degree of fidelity with which different compositors reproduced the general character of their copy. If one edition is distinguished by markedly uniform and modern orthography and by logical punctuation, while the other abounds in peculiarities of spelling and in punctuation that pays more regard to natural pauses than to syntax, we may conclude with some confidence that the latter represents the author's original more closely than the other, and we shall incline to make it our choice, even though we may suspect that it has more often corrupted his words, for these are the more easily corrected.²

In the others there is, so far as I am aware, no obvious clue to the relative authority of the editions, but this may of course only be due to their having been less closely studied.

¹ The Cambridge editors, discussing the 'Hayes' and 'Roberts' quartos of *The Merchant of Venice*, both dated 1600, originally held that 'there is reason to think that they were printed from the same MS.', a view that Aldis Wright later modified to 'Perhaps different copies of the same MS.'. It is now recognized that the 'Roberts' quarto was printed from the 'Hayes' in 1619. Chambers suggests that the quarto and folio texts of 2 *Henry IV* may have been printed from the same manuscript, but he admits that if so the manuscript had meanwhile been overhauled.

² I ought perhaps to attempt a rather more formal analysis of the notion of authority. In fact, of course, the authority of a text lies in its correctness, the fidelity with which it has preserved the exact form of what the author wrote. But all that we can hope to do is to form some idea of its *probable* correctness. For this we have two criteria. The first is our opinion of what I should like to call its

RULE 5

Having selected his copy-text an editor should reprint this exactly save for demonstrable errors, subject to necessary reservations in cases where there are alternative authorities no one of which can be assumed to be consistently more trustworthy than another.¹

That it is an editor's duty to follow his copy-text faithfully except in cases of evident corruption may readily be admitted as a general principle of modern editing. Nor is any qualification needed so long as there is only one substantive edition (cf. p. xiv) save in the case of authoritative correction considered under Rule 6. But whenever a choice has lain between two or more substantive editions, one of which had to be selected as the more authoritative, especially if these were of at all comparable authority, we are at once faced with the most fundamental question of principle in editorial theory.

There appear to be two possible courses, either of which may be or has been defended, but which start from different critical premises and lead to appreciably different results. According to one view (which, if I understand him rightly, was that held by McKerrow) when once an editor has chosen his copy-text, the best results will *always* be attained by following its readings, except in cases of 'manifest and indubitable' errors (i.e. errors that are obvious in the text itself

de jure authority, that which it possesses by right of origin, namely whether it is based on a report, a private transcript, a prompt-book, an autograph, or whether it is a mixed text. It is upon this that our view of its authority will primarily depend. But in the result the quality of the base may be modified by the quality of the transmission. For example, two transcripts of the autograph, or two editions independently printed from the prompt-book, would be of equal authority *de jure*: but one transcript or one print may be more faithful than the other. We are therefore driven to consider what by way of contrast might be called the *de facto* authority of the text, what we in fact find to be its apparent intrinsic correctness. Of this we can form an opinion only by considering the variants individually and deciding how often each text seems superior to the other, that is by generalizing our preferences of the several readings. We must then somehow combine the two varieties, when the result will be our judgement of the general authority of the text.

¹ 'the only possible course is . . . to reprint [the most authoritative text] as exactly as possible save for manifest and indubitable errors.'—*Prolegomena*, p. 7. With this statement compare the later proposal (p. 20) 'to reproduce as exactly as possible . . . what is given to us by . . . those "originals" which, considered as wholes, appear' to be the most authoritative, except 'where they appear to be certainly corrupt'.

without reference to any other): while according to the other view it is preferable, *where authority is divided*, to weigh the claims of each variant individually. No one would argue that because one substantive edition is generally more correct than another, it is necessarily so in any particular reading. It is therefore common ground that now one and now another text may best represent what the author wrote: the question is whether we can form any valid judgement as to which is in fact the more correct in any individual instance.

The first of these two opposing views is commonly and properly called 'conservative', since it proceeds on the principle of departing as little as possible from some one transmitted text. In its support it may be contended that while on the broad question of the relative authority of two editions it should be possible to form a more or less reliable judgement, the choice between particular readings is likely to be a good deal more difficult and less trustworthy. It claims, moreover, the practical advantage that it should lead to the establishment of something like a standard text, since several editors would arrive at much more uniform results on these lines than on others. To which supporters of the second view will reply by pointing out that since *ex hypothesi* the true reading may be preserved sometimes in one and sometimes in the other text, if an editor's judgement is worth anything at all, it should enable him to approach nearer to the author's original than does either of the transmitted texts; whereas if an editor's judgement in particular instances is worth nothing, he will have no adequate grounds for choosing between the alternative texts in the first instance, since his broad judgement of their relative claims to authority will often prove to be in the main a generalization of his judgement of individual readings (indeed, on McKerrow's showing this would be entirely so: see p. xxii: cf. also p. xxv, note 2).¹ In regard to editorial agreement, it is of course per-

¹ I fancy that some conservative critics are influenced by a rather subtler form of the argument than that I have advanced above. While admitting that when an editor makes an alteration to the copy-text in accordance with the second view he will usually thereby approach nearer to the author's original, they assert, quite truly, that, judgement being fallible, he will also sometimes depart further from it; and that to alter a correct reading is a far more serious matter than to fail to

fectly true that several editors working on the second principle will produce results less consonant than will editors working on the first—so long as the copy-text is given. But if past experience is any guide, it seems in fact unlikely that they will always agree in the choice of a copy-text (especially if a literary judgement of style be made the sole basis of choice) in which case they will differ among themselves even more than would editors working on the second principle. It is with some hesitation that I call this second view 'eclectic', but there is indeed no other term that properly describes it.¹

Now it appears to me that so long as we assert that the aim of a critical edition is to attain as nearly as possible to the words of the author (as laid down in Rule 1) we have no choice but to accept the eclectic principle (which in fact follows logically from it) whatever textual uncertainties this may involve, since the opposite conservative principle only attains certainty (if it does attain it) at the cost of critical freedom in pursuit of our declared object. It is the eclectic view, therefore, that I shall develop in this discussion. But before going further I wish to make clear that what I am advocating is not an irresponsible indulgence in personal predilection whenever a possible conflict of authority occurs. An editor's choice between alternative readings in two substantive editions will, in my view, be determined partly by the extrinsic authority of the editions and partly by the intrinsic merit of the readings. He will judge the authority of the editions in accordance with the theory he has formed

correct an error. In fact it is better to acquit ten guilty than to condemn one innocent. To which the obvious reply is that the legal analogy is misleading: our object is to present the author's reading in as many cases as possible, not at all costs to avoid doing injustice to the copy-text. No doubt mistakes may be made; but if, in an attempt to prevent the incompetent editor from making a fool of himself, we frame rules that fetter the competent editor in the pursuit of his proper ends, we shall be doing a signal disservice to criticism.

¹ The only alternative would be 'critical', which might be thought to beg the question. 'Eclecticism' is of course often used in a bad sense to mean the practice of admitting into the text, irrespective of their authority, any readings that an editor happens to fancy. Such a practice is naturally to be condemned as wholly uncritical. The term may, however, bear a quite reputable meaning applied to the treatment of texts of closely balanced authority, when we might perhaps speak of 'restricted eclecticism'.

of their character and relationship. Authority may be so preponderant as to be almost conclusive: again it may be so nearly balanced as to afford little guidance. His judgement of the merit of the readings is ultimately, no doubt, a matter of personal predilection.¹ There may possibly be occasions on which merit is so preponderant as to counterbalance a lack of authority: as a rule, however, its weight tells mainly when authority is more or less evenly balanced. These then are an editor's grounds of choice: it remains to see how he will apply them. Whenever, taking all things into account, it is possible to say with confidence that one reading rather than another represents the author's intention, or at least approaches nearer to that intention, an editor will of course adopt it into his text, or else make it the basis of an emendation. On the contrary, when, as may happen in the majority of cases, the claims of alternative readings appear evenly balanced, he will naturally retain the reading of the copy-text, this being the text which he has already decided is *prima facie* the more correct.² The exact degree of confidence that an editor need feel before he decides to alter the copy-text will necessarily depend on his mental constitution, and it would, I think, be futile to attempt to define it.³ I will only remark that it may properly depend to some extent upon the confidence with which he has made choice of the copy-text, and that a cautious editor when hesitating will give the copy-text the benefit of the doubt.⁴

¹ In the sense that it rests, not of course on what he would prefer to have written himself, but on what, after an objective review of all relevant considerations, he believes the author likely to have written.

² This at least saves the trouble of tossing a coin! (In the hypothetical case of two editions printed from the same manuscript, as considered on pp. xxv and xxxi, there might be an initial probability *against* the reading of the copy-text.)

³ I suspect that it is a reluctance to face this practical uncertainty and the fear of inconsistency in dealing with it, as much as any theoretical considerations, that have driven some editors into the conservative camp. Moreover, a mechanical rule that affords release from constant embarrassing judgements may appeal to the modesty of an able editor as well as to the laziness of an incompetent.

⁴ To judge alike from his words and from the evident bent of his mind I should say that McKerrow was to be classed as a conservative, but he has not made his position very clear in the *Prolegomena*, and a remark on p. 13 to the effect that in cases 'such as *Hamlet* Q2 and F1, *Lear*, and *Othello* problems of great difficulty and complexity arise', may mean that he was reserving judgement. Anyhow I feel certain that he was too good a critic to take up a bigoted position on any theoretical

To proceed. The fidelity with which the copy-text is to be followed is essentially governed by the question of 'authority'. As already explained (p. xii) it is necessary to choose one particular edition to serve as the basis of a critical text, and for this purpose an editor will naturally select that edition which he believes to represent the author's intention *on the whole* most accurately. But it was also explained that 'authority' is a comparative term, and that in this respect the claims of two (or more) substantive editions may be more or less evenly balanced (cf. pp. xxiv ff.).¹

This means that when we have two (or more) substantive editions of a play there is always a possibility and often a probability that the one which as the more authoritative we have chosen as our copy-text will need correcting by reference to the other, and the extent of the necessary correction will as a rule become proportionately greater as the two editions approach one another in authority. In the case of

issue, and I think he would have been prepared to modify his practice according to circumstances. Moreover, since he was prepared to consider readings imported into a derivative edition from an independent manuscript (see Rule 6) it seems absurd to suppose that he would have altogether refused to consider the readings of a substantive edition printed from such a manuscript.

¹ When this is so the fact that one edition is on the whole more accurate than another is no reason for assuming it to be correct in any particular instance. If we knew (which of course we never could) that when two editions differed one was correct twice as often as the other, then in any particular variant there would no doubt be a two-to-one probability in favour of the reading of that edition. But this is a merely *a priori* probability which ignores the intrinsic character of the readings and is of little practical account. (What we *could* know would be that among variants between whose merits it was possible to judge, preference lay twice as often with one edition as with the other, which would afford *some* reason to suppose that it was twice as often correct.)

Here I should like to draw attention to a fact which, though obvious, appears sometimes in danger of being forgotten, namely that to say that one text contains twice as many errors as another tells us next to nothing about their relative accuracy, unless we also know the total number of variants. Thus, in the case supposed, it would be quite untrue to say that one text was on the whole twice as accurate as the other. As a rule the great majority of the *readings* will be the same in the two texts and therefore correct (in the sense of accurately reproducing the common original). Even if there were on an average one *variant* in every blank-verse line (of about eight words), the texts would still have respectively 96 and 92 per cent of the *words* correct, and their relative accuracy would not be in the ratio of 2 : 1 but of 24 : 23, which is after all pretty close. If one text were twice as accurate as the other (and one or other were always correct) there would be no common readings at all!

two editions printed from the same manuscript there would not even be a presumption that the one that followed most closely the spelling and punctuation of the copy would also preserve the words most accurately—rather perhaps the reverse, for such fidelity in detail would suggest an inexperienced compositor, who would be more likely than an abler craftsman to misread the manuscript and make technical errors. In this instance therefore, while one or other text would of course have to be chosen as copy, every variant would need to be considered solely on its intrinsic merits.

This, as I have said, is a case which does not occur in Shakespeare's plays. It is possible nevertheless that one or two plays—I am thinking chiefly of *Othello*¹—may present somewhat analogous conditions. It is at least arguable that in these an original rather confused autograph, which had been a good deal altered and never finally reduced to order, was independently copied by two scribes, who each endeavoured to tidy it up according to his lights and fancy, and that it was from these transcripts that our rival texts are derived. If this is so an editor may be able to form some general opinion of the relative ability and trustworthiness of the two scribes, and in accordance with that opinion he will of course select his copy-text, but it would be naive to suppose that the reliability of the texts was anything but a matter of balance, and once again individual variants will have to be weighed very much on their own merits.²

Here, then, we may speak of the authority of the rival editions as not merely comparable but balanced, since in any particular variant there is little if any initial probability in favour of either reading. This may of course be merely due to our ignorance of the true relationship of the texts. *Hamlet*

¹ But also of *Troilus and Cressida*, for whatever the status of the folio text of that play, the manuscript used in its production appears to have been of comparable, but not necessarily or generally of superior, authority to that from which the quarto was printed. The case of 2 *Henry IV* is more obscure.

² In the cases considered above the textual conditions are those common, and indeed normal, in works transmitted in manuscript. These conditions were, naturally, known to McKerrow, and he even pointed out that they are occasionally met with in printed texts, as in the several editions of *Everyman* (*Prolegomena*, p. 36, and note 2). But this itself suggests a doubt whether he recognized the possibility of their ever being found in 'good' texts of Shakespeare's plays.

would presumably have been classed with *Othello* in this respect until reasons were found for supposing that behind the second quarto lay Shakespeare's autograph and behind the folio the Globe prompt-book. If this supposition is true, it is clearly on the quarto that an editor must principally rely. There is here no question of balance, although, in view of the highly respectable origin of both texts, we may still perhaps speak of their authority as comparable, especially since their respective merits are a good deal obscured by imperfections of transmission. Further still from any balance of authority are *Richard III* and *King Lear*, in which a manuscript either authorial or theatrical is apparently opposed to a surprisingly good memorial or shorthand report, though once again the relation is complicated by peculiarities of transmission. Finally we have the recognized 'bad' quartos, whose vanishing authority approaches, though I think never quite reaches, the absolute zero of most derivative editions.

So much for the general question of authority in its bearing on text-construction. But there are also more specific ways in which the presumed character and relationship of substantive editions may affect an editor's attitude towards the variant readings they contain. For instance, although one of them may have an overwhelming preponderance of authority *on the whole*, it may at the same time be inferior *in some particular respect*. Thus, while the folio text of *Richard III* is presumed to have behind it an authoritative manuscript of the play, there is reason to suppose that in the matter of oaths it has been to some extent censored in deference to the statute against profanity, and we do not even know whether this purgation was effected by the prompter in the 'book' or by the folio editor; so that in this respect it seems likely that the first quarto, containing a report of the play at a date earlier than the statute in question, represents more faithfully what the author wrote.¹ Again, the folio text of *King Lear* probably represents in

¹ Such reformation is a common feature of the folio, and even so debased a text as that of the 1602 quarto of *The Merry Wives* may preserve some Shakespearian expletives that have been suppressed in the folio version, though in this instance it may perhaps be thought that the quarto is altogether too unreliable to be safely used for correction.

the main the official 'book' of the play; yet it appears to represent it, not in its original form, but adapted to a slightly different cast, as shown by the amalgamation of the parts of the Doctor and the Gentleman in iv. vii. Furthermore, peculiarities of transmission may modify the general authority of a text. In *Richard III* the folio, having in fact been mostly set up (with much correction) from a copy of a late quarto, has inadvertently retained from that quarto errors that had been introduced in the course of successive re-printings. Similarly in *King Lear* the folio was actually printed (again with much correction) from the unauthoritative first quarto, and almost certainly contains errors owing to its having reproduced, from uncorrected sheets in its copy, oversights of the compositor that were actually corrected in the course of printing (cf. Rule 7).¹

Again, whatever may be the relative authority of two substantive editions, it will not suffice, when considering whether a particular passage in the one selected as copy-text is in any way open to question, to consider that text alone. An instance will make clear what I mean. As already explained, a modern editor will presumably choose the second quarto of *Hamlet* for his copy-text. In a familiar passage (i. v. 20) that quarto reads:

Like quills upon the fearful porpentine,

which is a perfectly good, indeed an excellent, reading, and of itself could raise no suspicion at all. However, the folio replaces 'fearful' by 'fretful', if anything a more excellent reading still. Now, it might be conjectured (as I once suggested) that the folio reading was an afterthought which the author had introduced into the prompt-book. But it happens that this is one of several variants (common to F and Q₁) to which the same explanation might apply, but which are all characterized by a similarity of graphic outline. From this we are driven to conclude that in spite of the excellence of both readings one or other is a misprint, though taking

¹ In *King Lear* and *Richard III*, besides the errors which the folio can be *proved* to have taken over from the quartos through imperfect collation, there are doubtless others of the same kind that can now be only *suspected*,

either by itself no one would ever suspect the fact.¹ I will further suggest that in this instance an editor, while basing his text upon the quarto, should nevertheless adopt the folio reading, not because it is better from a literary standpoint (though I think that is true) but because the quarto is known to be very carelessly printed, so that when it is a case of a simple misprint,² the folio, though at least one step further removed from the autograph, may yet be the better authority.³

Further to illustrate what seems to me an important point, I will give another example of a rather different kind and involving a text of less comparable authority. There is a line in *King Lear* (III. vii. 58) that in the authoritative folio runs:

In his annointed flesh stick boarish fangs.

There is nothing here to rouse suspicion, for though 'stick' is perhaps a trifle weak and makes one feel that 'strike' might have been better, it must be admitted that Shakespeare does not always write at the top of his bent. But in place of this word the quarto, a reported text, has the far more telling and vigorous 'rash', a reading that it is almost impossible to credit either to an actor or to a reporter, whose tendency is always to substitute a weaker and more commonplace word for a rarer and more individual one. An editor will therefore ask himself whether the prompter or the press reader may not have altered a word that he fancied would not be readily intelligible, especially as there are one or two other readings in the play where a like interference may be suspected (but see addenda p. 182).⁴

¹ This illustrates the danger of assuming that if a scribe or compositor makes a slip, this will reveal itself as nonsense in the text. Moreover, it is just those errors that happen to make sense that are the least likely to be observed and corrected at the time. For the same reason our own chance of detecting them is usually small.

² In fact, we know that it is not a misprint in the folio, since this is supported by Q1, but must have been the reading of the prompt-book. Actually, therefore, it is a question of the testimony of the playhouse scribe against that of the Q2 compositor, and on a plain issue of reading there is no doubt that the former is the more trustworthy.

³ It is well to bear in mind that one careless scribe or compositor may easily make more errors than two or three good ones, and that it is a very inaccurate one indeed that does not get ninety per cent of the words correct.

⁴ An editor should remember that (apart from indifferent variants between which no valid judgement is possible) if he accepts the reading of the copy-text as correct,

It follows that when there are two or more substantive authorities for the text, however preponderant one of them may be, an editor, in order to arrive as nearly as possible at the words of the author, must constantly bear in mind the circumstances of transmission peculiar to each and the accidents to which the text may have been exposed, and should *upon adequate evidence* be prepared to reject the reading of the generally more authoritative edition for that of the less.¹ This must not of course be done lightly or made an excuse for following personal predilection. Such decisions are among the most difficult that an editor has to make, and alterations are only to be allowed in obedience to a clear and reasoned view of the relevant textual conditions.

There is one respect in which even the most conservative of editors will probably be prepared to alter the copy-text. It happens, namely, in several instances that the edition which would naturally be judged the most authoritative omits certain passages that appear in another substantive edition otherwise less reliable. There may be no ground whatever for regarding these passages as spurious additions—or indeed as additions at all so far as the original text is concerned—or as having been on consideration rejected by the author. Thus there is reason to believe that three passages of some length that are found in the folio text of *Hamlet* also stood in the author's original manuscript and

he condemns all alternative readings as corrupt (unless either there has been revision, or the original manuscript contained alternative or ambiguous readings, between which, or between the interpretations of which, the author had not indicated his decision). And there are some readings that it is very difficult to suppose corruptions.

¹ Therefore it is going too far to say that a copy-text of paramount authority is only to be altered in cases of 'manifest and indubitable errors' (p. xxvi, note), for even if the errors discussed above are thought to be 'indubitable', they are certainly not 'manifest' in the sense of immediately obvious. I have therefore preferred the word 'demonstrable'.

I ought perhaps to explain that nothing I have said above or elsewhere should be taken to mean that when a reading of the copy-text appears to be corrupt it should necessarily be replaced by that of another substantive edition. So long as the copy-text can claim distinctly superior authority (including such a case as *Hamlet*, in which the choice lies between a careless but naive print from the autograph and an edited text derived ultimately from the same original) it may often be more judicious to emend the copy-text by conjecture than to adopt the alternative reading.

were either deliberately or accidentally omitted in printing the second quarto. In *Richard III* nearly twenty lines of dialogue (the 'Rougemont-jack' passage, iv. ii. 102-19), which are generally accepted as original, were omitted, perhaps on political grounds, from the folio text, and this shows further accidental lacunae. Both the quarto and the folio texts of *King Lear* appear to have been cut, and differently cut, for representation. The folio text of *Othello* contains passages recognized as original that do not occur in the quarto, but it is not certain that the folio is otherwise the more authoritative.¹ Further, where the folio was set up from a quarto it is by no means unusual to find it omitting single lines or more from its copy, evidently by accident, and there is every reason to suppose that it did the like where it was printed from manuscript. It appears therefore that from one cause or another many lines of a play as the author wrote it may not appear at all in what is generally the most authoritative edition, and it follows that the copy-text may on occasion need supplementing from another substantive edition.² At the same time it will of course be necessary to scrutinize with care the credentials of all such additional passages, and to admit into the text those only which, on a review of both external and internal evidence, appear to

¹ The same applies to *2 Henry IV* if the folio text of that play happens to be substantive.

² Essentially similar of course are the cases already mentioned (p. xvi) in which editions otherwise derivative supply what are either restorations of passages originally suppressed or else authoritative additions. For the treatment of these see p. xxxviii.

Perhaps this is the best place to add a word on the treatment of those cases, also previously mentioned (p. xv), in which a later substantive edition chosen as copy-text appears to contain passages printed, not from its usual source, but (doubtless owing to the failure of this) from an earlier and less authoritative edition, or in which a mixed text (owing to the failure of the manuscript elsewhere used for correction) has reproduced without material alteration passages from an earlier edition (p. xviii, note 3), so that for the passages in question the earlier edition (or, if that is a reprint, the earliest of its line of descent) is the only substantive text. It might be suggested that for these particular passages an editor should make the earlier edition (or its ancestor) his copy-text. This would no doubt be logical. However, the derivation is not always beyond controversy, and even when it is, a departure from the usual copy-text would introduce an inconsistency of style that would more than outweigh any theoretical advantage, since the earlier edition being *ex hypothesi* of lesser authority, its textual minutiae are likely to be of little consequence. As regards any variant readings it will of course be a question whether authority does not lie with the earlier edition.

have come from the pen of the author and to have formed part of his finished design.¹

RULE 6

An exception to the foregoing rule must be made in the event of a later derivative edition being shown to have been corrected or augmented by the author or from some authoritative source—short, that is, of such complete revision as would bring its derivative character in question. In the absence of external evidence it is not generally possible to ascertain how such corrections and additions found their way into the text or to determine precisely the authority of the source from which they are derived, and the readings will therefore have to be treated mainly on their own merits, those only being admitted that can produce satisfactory credentials. On the other hand, should the evidence as a whole be such as to convince an editor of the presence in adequate number of corrections or additions actually made by the author, he will, while still following the copy-text in matters of spelling, punctuation, and the like, introduce into it all the alterations of the revised edition, other than evident blunders and misprints, provided that there is no reason to suppose that any of them derive from a different and non-authoritative source.²

In discussing Rule 5 I considered the circumstances in

¹ Whether, when including passages extraneous to his copy-text, an editor should distinguish them by some typographical device, is a question of practice with which I am not now concerned.

² 'if . . . we were to assure ourselves . . . that certain corrections found in a later edition of a play were of Shakespearian authority, it would . . . undoubtedly be necessary to incorporate these corrections in our text, but unless we could show that the edition in question (or the copy from which it had been printed) had been gone over and corrected throughout by Shakespeare . . . the nearest approach to our ideal of an author's fair copy of his work in its final state will be produced by using the earliest "good" print as copy-text and inserting into it, from the earliest edition which contains them, such corrections as appear to us to be derived from the author. . . . We are . . . to consider whether a particular edition taken as a whole contains variants . . . which . . . seem likely to be the work of the author: and once having decided this to our satisfaction we must accept all the alterations of that edition, saving any which seem obvious blunders or misprints.'—*Prolegomena*, pp. 17–18. That McKerrow did not underrate the difficulty, in the absence of any external evidence as to the character of the alterations found in a reprint, 'of deciding whether they are authentic or not', is clear from his adding that 'though there may be a few readings of which we can say with some approach to certainty that they are not Shakespeare's, there are few, if any, of which we can safely make the opposite assertion' (p. 17).

which an editor may be justified in departing from his copy-text in favour of the reading of another substantive edition; it remains to consider those in which he may be justified in adopting readings from a derivative edition.

Though exceptional it is not in fact uncommon to find that a reprint differs from its copy to a greater extent, sometimes to a far greater extent, than can be accounted for by the normal vagaries of a compositor. It is evident that we have before us the work of a reviser who relied either upon some other source or upon the fertility of his own brain. The problem is what to do about his alterations.

In the first place it will be convenient to draw a distinction between definite additions of a substantive character (even if they involve some modification of the original text) and smaller and more pervasive alterations and additions intimately woven into the texture of the play. The instances mentioned (p. xvi) under Rule 3 (ii) belong to the former category: they are the 'fly' scene in *Titus* and the 'deposition' episode in *Richard II*.¹ Such additions in no way affect the character or status of the text as a whole: an editor will of course adopt the substantive text as his basis, and if he accepts the additions as authoritative,² will incorporate them from whatever edition first or best supplies them.³ At the same time, it must not be supposed that the two categories can always be clearly distinguished, for a series of definite

¹ Outside Shakespeare a parallel may be found in the expanded version of the Armada episode at the end of the 1633 quarto of the Second Part of Heywood's play *If you Know not Me you Know Nobody*, originally published in 1606. The scattered additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* in 1602 and Webster's 'augmentations' of Marston's *Malcontent* (1604) do not come in question here, since there is no suggestion of their being the work of the original author.

² This is of course a matter for the editor's judgement, which, unless there is anything in the circumstances of publication to guide him, can only rest on the intrinsic character of the additions. It is usually easier to judge the authenticity of a substantial passage than of an isolated reading, and greater confidence is justified. Nevertheless opinions will sometimes differ. While an editor is very unlikely to feel any doubt that the deposition of Richard was an original episode in the play, conflicting views have in fact been held as to whether the quite extraneous incident in *Titus* was either original or by the original author.

³ If, as in *Richard II*, there are two versions of an addition drawn from different sources, he will of course choose between them as he would between substantive editions. Should additions have been made in more than one edition, each addition will be treated individually.

and substantial additions may be found in conjunction with alterations of a minor sort, and the two may even merge imperceptibly into one another.¹ It is the minor alterations and additions that particularly demand consideration.

The case of complete revision by the author or through reference to an independent manuscript, of a nature to alter the general character of the text and so involve raising a reprint to substantive rank, has been discussed under Rule 3. The question now to be considered is that of a reprint into which sporadic alterations of a possibly authoritative character have been introduced.² In all cases it may conveniently be assumed that the corrections were made in a copy of some earlier edition, from which the reprint was then set up. This is doubtless what usually happened, though it is possible that revision was occasionally effected in proof.

In the first place then an editor will have to satisfy himself that the alterations are not merely due to a literary reviser (whose tinkering would of course be of no authority) but that there is at least a presumption that they derive either directly or indirectly from the author or at any rate from the theatre. Having done so he will next consider their possible origin. Genuine corrections may get into a reprint in several different ways, which (generally following

¹ In this connexion *2 Henry IV* (assuming the folio to have been in fact printed with revision from the quarto) is particularly interesting. For the folio not only contains a number of substantial passages absent from the earlier edition, but also makes many minor additions and alterations in the text. There can be no doubt that it had access to a manuscript or that the bulk of the alterations came from this source. Nor is there any need to question that the substantial additions are original passages cut in the quarto. For these the folio supplies the only text, and we must gratefully accept it whatever its quality may be. But it is by no means clear that in other respects the manuscript used in preparing the folio was superior to that from which the quarto was printed, and the authority of the minor alterations therefore remains open to criticism.

² It will of course be realized that in drawing the distinction between revision to be brought under Rule 3 (a) (b) and such as may pass as sporadic, an editor is necessarily guided by the extent and nature of the alterations and even in some degree by considerations of convenience (cf. p. xx, note). But it is only if there is a question of making the revised edition his copy-text that the decision is of any importance. If the text of a play originally printed from a reputable manuscript was later revised by comparison with another manuscript of no greater authority (as may have happened with *Troilus and Cressida*) an editor will presumably choose the first edition as his copy-text, and whether he classes the reprint as substantive or derivative will make no difference to the use he may make of its readings (cf. p. xxi).

McKerrow¹) we can distinguish as follows. (i) Alterations may have been made by the author himself on glancing through a print, either casually or with the express purpose of correction²—these may of course include afterthoughts as well as corrections proper. (ii) Corrections may have been made through reference to an independent manuscript, which may or may not have contained author's revisions. (iii) It is possible that the reprint may have been set up from a copy of an earlier edition that had been used as a prompt-book and been corrected or annotated by the book-keeper—a case closely analogous to the use of a theatrical manuscript, except that the alterations are more likely to have been made from memory than copied from a written source.³ (iv) Corrections may have been introduced by an actor or spectator from recollection of a performance—a case in which memory will necessarily have played a part.

Now, when we consider a particular correction or alteration by itself, we may come to the conclusion that its authenticity is guaranteed by its intrinsic character, namely by its being such as it is impossible to ascribe to a compositor or press reader or to some irresponsible 'improver'.⁴ In that case it will not matter *how* the variant got into the reprint: it will have to be accepted, and we need not trouble any more about it. But unless the number of changes in the text is very small, we may be quite sure that even if they are all genuine, they will not all be such as *could* only originate with the author. It is this residue of indeterminate alterations that constitutes our problem. In practice, and taking the variants of a reprint as a whole, everything will depend on the source from which they were drawn. For it is only those alterations that were made by the author with his own hand that can command unquestioning acceptance.

¹ He only mentions cases (i)–(iii), but adds that 'there are, no doubt, other possibilities' (*Prolegomena*, pp. 16–17). I do not pretend to have exhausted them.

² As Massinger did in copies he presented to his friends (*The Library*, 1923, iv. 207; 1924, v. 59). These, however, were never used as the basis of reprints.

³ I believe it is generally unlikely that a printed edition would have been substituted for a manuscript prompt-book unless the latter had been lost or destroyed—but I suppose it might have been merely worn out.

⁴ Admittedly a theoretical speculation. McKerrow's scepticism (see above, p. xxxvii, note 2) is probably justified,

Of those of playhouse origin—whether derived from a theatrical manuscript or from a print used as a prompt-book—we may still be inclined to accept all specific corrections as authoritative,¹ but caution will be needed in respect of alterations or additions where the original shows no sign of corruption. The latter may be of great interest, but they are not necessarily of much authority, for they need not be original features of the prompt-book, and if they are, need not have come from the hand of the author.² Playhouse alterations and additions are likely in particular to affect the stage directions; but while the prompt-book would be an excellent authority for those necessary to the conduct of the action as represented in the original edition, we should be on our guard against any that imply an alteration of that action, since these may very likely reflect the stage arrangements, not of the first performance, but of some later revival.³ It is obvious that however important these may be for the history of the play on the stage or of the company performing it, they have no bearing upon the intention of the author. Lastly, a reader who makes corrections or additions from memory of a performance is not only likely to make them imperfectly and to combine conjecture with recollection, but at the same time to introduce other changes for which there is no warrant at all.⁴

¹ See, however, p. xxxv, note. The warning in the second paragraph is equally relevant here.

² They may, for instance, be alterations made to meet the objections of the censor (as noted in *Richard III*: cf. p. xxxii) or to remove obscurities of language (as in *King Lear*: cf. p. xxxiv). Outside Shakespeare I may mention the curious case of the alterations in the 1650-1 edition of Beaumont (or Massinger) and Fletcher's *Elder Brother*, which sometimes but not always agree with the readings of MS. Egerton 1994(1). There can be little doubt that they are derived from a manuscript, but this, to judge from their character, was sometimes more and sometimes less correct than the original edition of 1637 (see *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses*, pp. 335-6).

³ Such as the amalgamation of parts in the 'book' of *King Lear* (see p. xxxiii) or the alteration of exits and entrances in *Titus* (I-II) consequent on the introduction of act divisions. Similar is the change from foils and daggers to foils and gauntlets made (in contradiction of the text at v. ii. 152) between the autograph and the prompt-book in the last scene of *Hamlet* in order to facilitate the exchange of weapons (as appears from the stage direction of Q1 at v. ii. 313—a direction that seems inconsistent with Wilson's theory of successive fashions in fencing: *The Manuscript of Hamlet*, i. 39).

⁴ A very instructive example is afforded by the alterations made in 1619 in

Thus it is only if the source of the alterations was a copy corrected by the author himself and by him alone that they can claim implicit confidence. Elsewhere whatever genuine corrections there may be are liable to have become intermingled with others of a doubtful character. For any general acceptance of the alterations in a reprint it will therefore be necessary that we should be able to distinguish cases of category (i)—authorial correction—from all others.

Unfortunately, in the absence of external evidence,¹ there appears to be no possibility of doing this with any approach to certainty. While there may be clear evidence that not

a reprint of the 'bad' quarto of 2 *Henry VI* (*The First Part of the Contention*) which we are fortunately able to check with the authoritative folio text. Comparison shows that certain additions must be derived memorially from a performance, and some minor alterations likewise anticipate the folio readings, but these are almost lost in a crowd of other changes that, whatever their origin, we know from the folio to be without authority.

¹ In Shakespeare this is negligible. There are, it is true, three instances of a play being stated to have been revised by Shakespeare. The earliest known quarto of *Love's Labour's Lost*, 1598, bears on its title the words 'Newly corrected and augmented / By W. Shakespere'; the third quarto of 1 *Henry IV*, 1599, bears the words 'Newly corrected by W. Shake-speare'; and the third quarto of *Richard III*, 1602, the words 'Newly augmented, / By William Shakespeare' (the words 'By William Shake-speare' had already appeared in the second quarto in 1598). But there is no doubt that in each instance the punctuation is misleading, and that what was meant was that Shakespeare was the author of the play, and that the text had been revised. Of *Love's Labour's Lost* this was probably true, since the edition appears to have been published to replace a 'bad' quarto (compare the words 'Newly corrected, augmented, and amended' on the title of *Romeo and Juliet*, 1599, and 'Newly imprinted and enlarged to almost as much again as it was, according to the true and perfect copy' on that of *Hamlet*, 1604-5: neither of these bore Shakespeare's name). If so the edition was probably set up from manuscript and was not a reprint at all. In 1 *Henry IV* and *Richard III* there was no ground whatever for the assertion that the text had been corrected or augmented. The only other statements of the kind on the titles of Shakespeare quartos are the words 'With new additions of the parliament scene and the deposing of King Richard' on the title of some copies of the fourth edition of *Richard II*, 1608, which is inaccurate, since the only addition is the deposition episode in the parliament scene, and the words 'Newly corrected' on that of a late quarto of *The Merry Wives* (1630), which means no more than that it was the first quarto to contain the full text of the play as already printed in the folio. Both these bear Shakespeare's name, but it is not connected with the revisions. As regards the folio, the statement on the title, 'Published according to the true original copies', is untrue if intended to imply that all the plays were there printed from authentic manuscripts, and is otherwise too vague to be relevant. Some weight should be allowed to the editors' assurance that the plays were 'cured and perfect of their limbs', but the proper scope of this is limited, and in any case no claim is made that the curing had been done by the author.

all the alterations in a reprint can have originated with the author, the mere absence of such indications affords no reason to suppose that they did. The most we can hope to do is to show the probability of a playhouse source, and such will therefore be the highest authority that an editor will be justified in assuming for the majority of the alterations in any reprint.¹

We have now arrived at the position that in no case in which we are without external evidence can there be any general acceptance of the corrections and alterations of a reprint. Each individual reading will have to be considered on its merits subject to any opinion we may be able to form of its probable source. And here we come to an important consideration that will largely determine an editor's practice under the present rule. It is that the authority of a reprint in the matter of corrections and alterations must be judged in relation to the authority of the original of which it is a reprint.² If we had reason to believe that a play was in the first instance set up from the author's own manuscript, there would be no justification for departing from its text in favour of readings derived, say, from the prompt-book,³ unless either the original reading had suffered demonstrable corruption at the hands of the printer (which would anyhow lay it open to emendation) or else that the reading of the

¹ There is certainly no evidence that Shakespeare ever himself corrected a reprint of any of his plays, and it seems on general grounds extremely unlikely. On the other hand it is usual to suppose that certain plays reprinted from quartos in the first folio were to some extent collated with playhouse manuscripts (or possibly, which comes to much the same thing, were printed from copies that had served the prompter) and there are no doubt reasons for this opinion. (The chance of correction from recollection of a performance is hardly worth considering. The instance mentioned above (p. xli, note 4) seems, indeed, reasonably certain, but it is only so because we happen to have an independent text of much greater authority with which to compare the variants. This could not happen in any case in which we are here interested.)

² It is throughout assumed (as here stated) that the corrected reprint belongs to the same line of descent as the copy-text. This is of course not necessarily so, and indeed the reprint of *2 Henry VI* already discussed (p. xli, note 4) is an exception. One could construct quite a pretty case on these lines, but it would have no practical application to any text that I know of.

³ This was apparently not the opinion of Heminge and Condell, but their outlook naturally differed somewhat from that of a modern editor.

prompt-book was manifestly an afterthought of the author.¹ On the other hand, if we believed the copy for the original edition to have been a transcript made by a careless and indifferent scribe, we should be thankful to replace its readings whenever possible by those of the authorized prompt-book, and we should do so with even greater confidence if we suspected the copy for the original edition to have been, not a transcript at all, but a report. It follows that before an editor decides to make any considerable use of the variants of a derivative edition, he must satisfy himself, not only that they are derived from a reputable source, but that this source possessed an authority greater than that of the original edition. The fact is that in respect of the variant readings we have the equivalent of two substantive texts between which we have to make our choice. If the later is evidently of higher authority we shall incline to give it our adhesion in cases of doubt; if the two appear to be of approximately equal authority we shall be forced to depend upon the intrinsic merit of each individual reading, and our action will be the same as in dealing with similar substantive editions (cf. p. xxxi).

But the task of determining the relative authority on the one hand of the original edition (or rather of the manuscript from which it was printed) and on the other of the source of the alterations in a reprint, is likely to prove one of great delicacy. The former will have already been considered by an editor when selecting his copy-text, supposing that he had to make a choice between rival substantive editions, and since a complete text is in question he should have arrived at some reasonably reliable conclusion. At least we must assume this to be possible if criticism is to have any validity at all. But to judge the authority of a manuscript known only from a number of isolated and perhaps imperfectly reported readings is a far more difficult task, and it seems very unlikely that any more definite or favourable conclusion will be reached than that the readings are probably of

¹ Perhaps we should make a further exception in favour of stage directions required to make clear the original action. The autograph might be deficient in these.

theatrical origin.¹ An editor will in consequence have to depend mainly upon his estimate of the authority of the original edition, allowing that of the corrections a certain mean value. In other words, unless the former is either exceptionally high or exceptionally low, it will be reasonable to assign to the readings of the reprint more or less comparable authority and treat them simply on their intrinsic merits. This may seem rather an impotent conclusion to a lengthy discussion, but to reach it a full analysis of the circumstances seemed necessary, and it is after all the natural outcome of an essentially indefinite position. If an editor thinks that at any point he is able to define the position more clearly, I think he will find in the course of the foregoing discussion some indication of how he should proceed.

It would appear therefore that the prospect of establishing the presence of any considerable body of authoritative correction in a derivative edition of a play is rather remote. At least, that is so when the general conditions are those we find prevalent in Shakespeare (see p. xlii, note). Elsewhere in the Elizabethan drama, and more generally in other forms of literature, there may be a possibility of isolating the all-important case of correction by the author's own hand. For it sometimes happens that we are favoured with external evidence, in the form of statements on title-pages or in prefaces and the like, supported by internal evidence in the text, that illuminates the position and enables an editor to proceed with greater confidence.² In view of these cases it may be worth while to pursue the matter of correction a little further.

¹ No doubt, *some* general estimate of the value of the corrections may be possible on internal evidence (a *de facto* estimate as explained at p. xxv, note 2). If the great majority of the alterations appear to be of intrinsic merit we shall no doubt be inclined to give consideration even to those whose claims are less evident; while if the majority appear intrinsically inferior we shall look askance even at those that are individually attractive. But such a general estimate can only affect our judgement of the several variants, not our procedure.

² I may instance the second quarto of Marston's *Parasitaster*, which appeared in 1606 'corrected of many faults, which by reason of the author's absence, were let slip in the first edition'. The second quarto of Dekker's *Honest Whore*, renamed in 1604-5 *The Converted Courtesan*, is probably another example, but of this no copy of the title-page appears to have survived. (In both these instances the corrected edition was printed in part from the same setting of type as the original and doubtless within a few weeks of it.)

Assuming then that on a careful review of the evidence as a whole an editor is satisfied that a reprint has actually been corrected by the author himself,¹ what will be his attitude to the alterations? This will depend upon two considerations: the extent of the correction and its conformity to type. It is agreed that the external evidence, in order to justify the assumption of the author's responsibility, must be adequately borne out by the internal evidence of the intrinsic character of the readings. The presence of two or three acceptable corrections would hardly justify the adoption of a number of others of dubious character. The apparently genuine corrections must be numerous enough to lead to the presumption that the text has undergone fairly continuous scrutiny. If that is so then serious attention will have to be paid to other alterations themselves of a less evidently authoritative character, for if it is certain that many of the changes are due to the author it will be legitimate to suppose that he is responsible for all that can reasonably be ascribed to him. And if the alterations are the author's we have no right to pick and choose among them. Thus it may be laid down that in such a case *all* apparently intentional alterations² should be accepted, provided that they are homogeneous in character.³ The qualification is necessary because analysis may show that the alterations are not in fact all of one kind, and therefore possibly not all of one origin. A reprint that contains corrections by the author may also have been edited from another point of view by another hand. For example, side by side with the author's corrections may appear other changes made, perhaps in defiance of metre

¹ One might be tempted to add 'or by reference to the author's own manuscript', and it would no doubt sometimes be legitimate to do so, but the intervention of a second hand must always introduce some risk of contamination and impair the authority of the revision.

² This is not, of course, intended to include printers' modernizations and so forth: these are to be treated as matters of spelling in which the copy-text is always to be followed. We are only concerned with significant variants. Admittedly the distinction may not always be easy to draw.

³ The corrections are of course to be taken from the earliest edition in which they occur. Should more than one edition have been corrected, each correction is to be taken from the first edition that contains it, since a later corrected edition may have already corrupted some of the earlier corrections.

and grammar, evidently in deference to the censor, and others again, vitiating the language, due to the press reader's misunderstanding of rare or obsolete words. It should be obvious that the presence of corrections belonging to the first class is no reason for attributing authority to the others.¹

So much for reprints that are assumed to contain authoritative alterations. Apart from these the readings of derivative editions possess no authority whatever (see p. xiv). It is never legitimate to substitute them for readings of the copy-text unless the latter are manifestly erroneous, and they should then be treated exactly like any other conjectural emendations.

RULE 7

*Should variants exist between different examples of the edition selected as copy-text, an editor must be guided in his choice not only by the intrinsic merits of each reading but by a consideration of the character and distribution of the variants as a whole. In certain cases he may have to take cognizance of variants in editions other than the copy-text.*²

In this connexion several points of some interest call for consideration. The variants in question arise of course

¹ McKerrow's insistence that if an edition 'contains variants . . . which . . . seem likely to be the work of the author . . . we must accept *all* the alterations of that edition' must be taken to override his previous injunction that we should accept 'such corrections as appear to us to be derived from the author' (see above, p. xxxvii, note 2). Moreover, the absence of any qualification in the *Prolegomena* was apparently no oversight. As long ago as 1904 McKerrow wrote in his edition of Nashe (ii. 197): 'if an editor has reason to suppose that a certain text embodies later corrections than any other, and at the same time has no ground for disbelieving that the corrections, *or some of them at least*, are the work of the author, he has no choice but to make that text the basis of his reprint' (my italics), and he consequently printed *The Unfortunate Traveller* from the second edition, although he at least suspected that some of the alterations in it had been made for purely typographical reasons and that others were the work of someone unfamiliar with the text (*ibid.*, pp. 194-5). This is 'conservatism' indeed. It will further be observed that in view of the fact that the edition advertised itself as 'Newly corrected and augmented' (though the latter was hardly true) he considered that the alterations must be assumed to be the author's unless there were positive grounds for rejecting the conclusion. Here he was dealing with a type of literature in which the conditions are very different from what they are in the drama; but his position remained unaltered (see further p. lv). (The fact that he advocated taking the latest corrected edition as the copy-text raises a quite different, though intimately related, question, and on this he certainly altered his opinion: see p. xxxvii, note 2.)

² This question is not touched on in McKerrow's *Prolegomena*.

through the common Elizabethan practice of correcting the type while a sheet of a book was in course of printing. It is not necessary to go into the matter from a bibliographical point of view except to remark that the unit of variation is the 'forme' (one side of the unfolded sheet) and that errors may be accidentally introduced in the process of correction.¹

An editor will of course as a rule accept the corrected form of a reading. This form however is not to be determined by considering each reading by itself and deciding which variant is preferable. By a corrected reading is to be understood the reading of the corrected state of the forme, unless it appears to be due to accident. There is seldom any difficulty in determining, from an examination of the variants in the forme as a whole, which is in fact the original and which the corrected state. But a warning is necessary, not only in respect of the accidental errors already mentioned (such as the dropping of a letter when the type was unlocked) but to the effect that the press reader was not always careful or successful in consulting the copy, and that his 'corrections' are in consequence not by any means always correct. Indeed, such 'corrections' are at times no more authoritative than those found in reprints, and it may happen that the compositor's original blunder is a better guide to the reading of the copy than the press reader's 'correction'.²

One small point should be mentioned. When a correction

¹ The technical aspect is treated in McKerrow's edition of Barnes's *Devil's Charter*, 1904, pp. xv-xvi, and in his *Introduction to Bibliography*, 1927, pp. 204-13; the first part of my *Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear'*, 1940, may also be consulted. The statement that the unit of correction is the forme means that in any copy of a book (provided the make-up has not in any way been disturbed) all the pages belonging to the same forme of a particular sheet are necessarily in the same state of correction, but that pages belonging to different formes may be in different states. Editors have not infrequently fallen into the error of speaking of *copies* as corrected or uncorrected. In fact it is very unusual, when variation is widespread, for all the sheets in any particular copy to be in the same state. It is not uncommon for each individual *sheet* to be always either corrected or uncorrected, whether through variation being confined to one forme or through the two formes being always in the same state; but there is no bibliographical necessity for this to be so, and in fact the two formes are sometimes found in different states.

² In the first edition of *King Lear*, 1608, the press reader altered the compositor's impossible 'crulentious' to 'tempestious', though the copy must evidently have read 'contentious' like the folio, and he altered 'alapt' to 'attaskt', though the former is obviously a misreading of 'ataxt'.

was made in the type it often necessitated altering the form or spelling of some other word in the line in order to secure typographical adjustment. If an editor accepts the correction he should adopt the correction only and preserve the rest of the line as originally set up, this being the nearest approach possible to the form of the copy. In other words an editor should take as his copy-text the original setting of each forme, introducing into it from the corrected setting only the deliberate alterations of the press reader, or such of them as he accepts, and not the consequential changes that the compositor was forced to make.

But it is not only variation in the copy-text itself that an editor may need to take into consideration, since a reading in a mixed text may depend upon a variant in some earlier edition. For example, an editor will certainly take the folio text of *King Lear* as the basis of his own. But the folio text, though ranking as substantive, was in fact set up from a copy of the first quarto, and this edition contains an unusual number of corrections made as the sheets were going through the press. The copy used no doubt had some formes in the original and some in the corrected state. As already mentioned (p. xxxiii) there is reason to believe that the folio repeats from the quarto some original errors that had already been set right in the corrected state of the formes: I may add that one reading of the folio appears to be derived from a mis-correction by the press reader.¹ It is evident, therefore, that an editor, while basing his text on one substantive edition (unless it is so in its own right) may have to take account of variants between copies of another. And indeed this other edition need not even be a substantive one, since for example the folio text of *Richard III* might have taken over original errors from uncorrected formes, or unauthorized emendations from corrected formes, in the quartos of either 1602 or 1622, though in fact so far as I am aware no variants have been observed between different copies of these editions.

¹ Namely 'at task', seemingly a modification of 'attask', the reading of the corrected state of the forme in the first quarto, but this (as we saw in the previous note) should have been 'ataxt'.

These appear to be the only ways in which the question of variation can become relevant to the actual readings of the copy-text. But should variants be found in a subordinate substantive edition or in a derivative edition containing possibly authoritative alterations (or indeed in any edition whose readings he proposes to consider) an editor will naturally need to determine which is in fact the corrected state of each forme before considering what use may be made of the readings of the edition.

Only one other point need be mentioned. There is occasionally a suspicion that a reading in a reprint may be derived from an unrecorded corrected state of the sheet in the substantive edition that served as copy, and therefore possess an authority it could not otherwise claim. It is possible, though I think not likely, that one or two readings in the second quarto of *King Lear* may be of this nature; while the second quarto of *Richard III* is generally so exact a reprint of the first as to have led to the suggestion that two additional lines it contains may have been actually inserted in the earlier edition while the sheet was going through the press. This, however, is pure speculation.

NOTE ON ACCIDENTAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TEXT.—Besides the essentials of reading every text is characterized by what may conveniently be called the 'accidents' of presentation, namely the spelling, punctuation, and other scribal or typographic details. It has been with the essentials that these Prolegomena have been mainly concerned, but in conclusion a few words on the subject of the accidentals may be in place.

Whatever practice may be thought desirable in a popular or reading edition, in a critical—that is, a critics'—edition modern opinion is unanimously in favour of preserving the spelling and punctuation of the original authority, at least so far as they are not actually misleading.

But while opinion seems to be unanimous, I am not certain that the grounds upon which it rests are always very clearly distinguished. In order to arrive at a more exact analysis one may begin by asking: Suppose that we had before us the author's manuscript written in his own hand and carefully prepared for publication; ought we then in a critical edition to follow exactly its spelling, punctuation, and so forth? Obviously—if our object is to present the text in a form as close to the author's fair copy as possible. But strictly interpreted, this

rule would lead in the case supposed to a diplomatic reprint, which is not quite what we set out to attain. Concentrating for the moment on the matter of spelling, we may ask the further cautious question: What alternative is there, assuming that nothing must be done in any way to distort the author's language? That modernization on the lines usually followed does quite seriously misrepresent Elizabethan English, experience has amply proved. To print *banquet* for *banket*, *fathom* for *faddom*, *lantern* for *lanthorn*, *murder* for *murther*, *mushroom* for *mushrump*, *orphan* for *orphant*, *perfect* for *parfit*, *portcullis* for *perculace*, *tattered* for *tottered*, *vile* for *vild*, *wreck* for *wrack*, and so on, and so on, is sheer perversion. And how, in modern spelling, are we to render Spenser's rime?—

By this arriued there

Dame Vna, wearie Dame, and entrance did requere.

No doubt a more judicious treatment is possible than that usually found in editions of Shakespeare—one that will even avoid the false suggestion of *choir* for *quire*, with its implication of *chorister* for *quirister*—but it will be merely a step towards normalization. In favour of normalization something might no doubt be said, since it was after all the aim of contemporary printers: nevertheless the objections to it appear to be conclusive. Today a standard orthography masks quite a wide divergence of pronunciation even among people of the same local and social surroundings. In Shakespeare's day a writer's individualities of speech reflected themselves naturally in his spelling, and to alter his spelling is to destroy a clue to his language. There is always a difficulty in distinguishing between what are really different phonetic forms and what are mere arbitrary variations of spelling. How far in Elizabethan times did the spellings *dance* and *daunce* reflect any difference or fluctuation of pronunciation? Which is only to say that, whether in itself normalization is desirable or not, our present philological equipment is inadequate to the task. This anyhow rules it out as a practical expedient.

But, it will be objected, what in fact we usually possess is not the author's manuscript but an edition printed at best from that manuscript, perhaps more likely from a transcript or a transcript of a transcript, at worst from a memorial or shorthand report. Is such an edition likely to preserve sufficient of the individualities of an author's spelling to make it worth while following it? This is, I think, where the ordinary reader is likely to misunderstand the critic's position. For the critic modernization has no attraction in itself. So long as there is any chance of an edition preserving some trace, however faint, of the author's individuality, the critic will wish to follow it:

and even when there is none, he will still prefer an orthography that has a period resemblance with the author's to one that reflects the linguistic habits of a later date. And on both grounds he will prefer to follow the earliest edition in any line of descent rather than a later one. How much the language of a work may be perverted in the course of a generation may be seen in the successive reprints of *The Shepherds Calendar* between the first quarto of 1579 and the folio of 1611. (This is, I admit, an extreme example.) There is one further consideration that will appeal to critics: the necessity namely, for an estimate of possible corruption and for any attempt at emendation, of an accurate record of the transmitted form of the words.¹

Perhaps something should be said specially about punctuation. We can probably rely on that of the early editions even less than we can on their spelling. If we had the original manuscript before us we should very likely find the pointing both erratic and deficient. It might at times strike us as effective, but it would probably be unreliable. And as a rule the compositor probably paid little attention to it. It may be that some striking instances of dramatic pointing that critics have discovered in early editions do in fact represent sudden inspirations of the author, though it is likely that they have survived more or less by chance in a general system (such as it is) imposed upon the text in the printing house. But since this system, however admittedly defective, is noticeably different from that now in vogue, it will be well not to alter it more than is necessary to render the text intelligible. Just as the language of an Elizabethan author is better represented by his own spelling than by ours, so the flow of his thought is often more easily indicated by the loosely rhetorical punctuation of his own day than by our more logical system.²

Capitalization is another accident of the manuscript. And here two varieties should be distinguished. The fashion of giving initial capitals to certain words in a sentence has of course varied greatly from age to age. Different authors and different printers may also have had their own habits—including perhaps the use of so-called 'emphasis' capitals. It may be regarded in much the same way as punctuation,

¹ I am here viewing the matter from the standpoint of the editor, whose duty it is to present the words of his author in the most complete and authoritative form attainable; but it is at the same time only reasonable to allow weight to the demands of the philologist, who needs exact and reliable texts as a basis for the study of linguistic phenomena.

² Unless I am mistaken there has lately been a reaction against the heavy logical punctuation, dividing off all parallel or subordinate clauses and parenthetical phrases, that characterized the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. We seem to be drifting or groping towards a lighter and more natural punctuation and regaining some of the Elizabethan freedom.

and a printer probably followed his copy to much the same extent. But quite distinct are the capitals it became the habit of printers to put at the beginning of verse lines in a play. These are not as a rule found in manuscripts and may be presumed to have no sanction beyond the printing house. It is rare to find an edition apparently following its copy in this respect,¹ as in the first quarto of *The Merchant of Venice* in 1600 and in one section of the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647.

The only other accident we need consider is line division. With certain exceptions (such as the tendency of the Shakespeare first folio occasionally to split a line in two²) the printer may be supposed normally to have followed his copy fairly closely in this. The author, on the contrary, was, we may suspect, often loose in his habits, and it would be unwise to attach any great significance to what he appears to have done. The blank-verse line was itself an elastic unit, and Shakespeare at any rate, especially in his later work, did not seek to cut it to a rigid length. But quite apart from this an author's scribal practice was often lax: he would run short lines on to others merely for convenience of writing or to economize space. Shakespeare, if he was the author of the famous three pages in *Sir Thomas More*, wrote four lines as two at the foot of one page. Moreover, an author sometimes crowded additions into the margin of his manuscript in such a way that the metrical structure was obscured, in which case the printer was reduced either to setting them as prose or to cutting them up as best he could in accordance with his own ideas of verse. Also the absence of capitalization in the manuscript tended to obscure the distinction between verse and prose, and it is not uncommon to find the printer mistaking one for the other. It follows that as a rule no great importance attaches to the line division in early printed texts, and an editor may be mainly guided by his own sense of the fitness of the verse.

It is the decision to preserve what I have called the accidents of the text that binds the critical editor in every case to the choice of a particular edition as his copy. For him the copy-text enters into editorial practice in a double capacity: as the text assumed to have departed least from the spelling and punctuation of the author it supplies him with the basis and texture of his own; again as the most

¹ Only apparently, I think. The fact that a few prints, like most manuscripts, generally eschew capitals at the beginning of lines of verse is more probably due to an accidental shortage in the upper case than to any intention of following the copy.

² *Prolegomena*, pp. 47-9. There are instances in the Beaumont and Fletcher first folio likewise though they appear to be much less frequent.

'authoritative' text it generally governs his choice of readings.¹ But as I have said before, an edition may carry different weight in these two capacities. The path of a modernizing editor is comparatively smooth: he accepts the common part of a number of editions, and there is no obvious inconsistency in completing his text by drawing on each at will. Such a course is not open to the critical editor: the basis of one particular text is forced upon him, and any departure he makes from the readings of that text takes on the appearance of violence done to the unity of the basis. I have no doubt that this is largely responsible for the modern 'conservative' tendency to stick in all cases and at all costs to the readings of a single edition, a tendency that has no doubt been on the whole beneficial, but which as a canon of criticism appears to me mistaken.²

Lastly, it is desirable that the preservation of accidentals should be seen in proper perspective and not allowed to degenerate into blind dogma. An editor, being bound to follow a particular edition, will naturally prefer whichever appears to be most closely related to the autograph or nearest to it in date. Whatever the degree of accuracy with which the earliest edition in any line of descent reproduced the accidents of the original (always supposing that it was in *some* measure influenced by its copy) it is clear that every reprint will have increased the divergence; while *caeteris paribus* a later substantive edition is more likely than an earlier to have imposed alien fashions upon the text. At the same time, an editor should not fall into the error of supposing that by following an earlier edition he is always or necessarily achieving a substantial advantage—even if we leave 'bad' quartos out

¹ I believe this distinction to be important. In the matter of accidents the copy-text is always to be followed unless manifestly incorrect or misleading: in that of readings it may often give way to another substantive or corrected edition. This is why, if there is a conflict, an editor, in choosing his copy-text, will tend to rely on fidelity in reproducing the accidents of the original rather than the apparently more important essentials of reading (cf. pp. xiii, xx, xxv, xxxi). And see p. 182.

² As I have written elsewhere, 'the reaction against the eclectic methods of most of the great editors of Shakespeare, however necessary and salutary, may be carried too far. Their fundamental mistake was not so much that they were prepared on occasion to introduce into the copy-text [or into what they on the whole treated as such] readings from other sources, as that in doing so they relied upon personal predilection instead of critical analysis' (*R.E.S.*, 1941, xvii. 144). And see p. xxviii above. I may confess to having strong 'conservative' instincts myself. I feel that a particular edition, and far more a particular manuscript in the case of a medieval work, possesses a certain individuality of its own, which makes it a sort of minor literary creation, whose integrity I am loath to violate. (For this view see *The Library*, 1932, xiii. 135.) I am conscious however that this is the bibliographer's outlook, and that it is only a stepping stone, though an essential one, towards the truly critical position.

of account. Unless an edition was itself set up from the autograph the chance of its preserving any appreciable individual likeness to the spelling, punctuation, and graphic peculiarities of the author is rather remote. Whence it follows that an editor, if he is compelled by textual considerations to take as copy-text what is in fact a revised reprint or a later substantive edition, need not fear that he is sacrificing anything of importance in the matter of accidentals, since the circumstances of the case as a rule make it improbable that the earlier text stood in any close relation to the original. Still less should it be supposed that archaic spelling possesses some peculiar merit of its own. The editor who made a virtue of having preserved the 'old spelling' when he printed the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher from the folio of 1679 had not begun to understand the grounds of modern practice.

ADDITIONAL NOTE TO PAGE xlvii

McKerrow's views on the acceptance of alterations in a reprint supposed to have been revised by the author, as cited in note 1, are on the face of it so surprising as to raise a suspicion of misunderstanding. I have little doubt that the explanation is that he altered his views on one particular point without realizing how this affected other points. In 1904 he held the opinion that if a reprint could be proved to contain alterations by the author, it was an editor's duty to make it his *copy-text*. This, for a conservative editor, meant accepting it as a whole without further question. Later he came to doubt whether a reprint ought in fact to be taken as copy-text, and maintained that the better practice was to print from the first edition and introduce into this the revisions made in the reprint. But he still apparently clung to the view that an editor was bound to accept *all* the alterations in such a reprint, whatever their nature, although he had receded from the position on which that view was originally based. Consequently when, after giving (in the first paragraph on p. 17) an unexceptionable account of his proposed procedure, he became unnecessarily alarmed at a possible charge of 'eclecticism', he endeavoured to harmonize what he had said with the quite different method he had followed in editing Nashe, with the inevitable result that his treatment of the question as a whole shows signs of hesitation and inconsistency.

I. INTRODUCTION.—THE FOLIO AND THE QUARTOS 'GOOD' AND 'BAD'

I FEEL that it is an act of temerity, not to say presumption, to offer to discuss the editing of Shakespeare in the College where between seventy and eighty years ago was produced what is still the standard and received text of his works, and in the University whose Press is today publishing what is perhaps the most revolutionary and individual edition that has ever appeared. It has been my good fortune to number both Aldis Wright and Dover Wilson among my friends; for each I have, in different ways, felt both affection and regard, and I should be sorry if it were thought that I was wantonly intruding on their domain. Yet one who has been honoured with the invitation to deliver the Clark Lectures could hardly, it seems to me, pay a better tribute to Aldis Wright's senior collaborator than by attempting to review the attitude of scholarship towards the editing of Shakespeare's plays as it appears now, some sixty years after his death. It is with full realization of the achievement of the 'old' Cambridge editors that I approach my task. But our appreciation of Shakespeare's texts and of all the questions involved in their critical examination has undoubtedly altered, and I believe I may say advanced, greatly since Aldis Wright and his colleagues set about their gigantic task soon after the middle of the nineteenth century. We only need to glance at Professor Dover Wilson's textual essays, and compare them with the meagre and almost disdainful remarks of his predecessors, to realize the magnitude of the change; while he has himself done much to promote the advancement of our knowledge by the alertness of his critical imagination, and at the same time perhaps something to embarrass it by the very fertility of the same quality. However, I am not here to read an historical lecture on the changes of editorial outlook, interesting as that subject may be, still less to apportion praise or blame to individual editors. All I propose is to review to the best of my ability the critical position as it stands today, the position that to a large

extent explains the manifest differences between the 'old' Cambridge Shakespeare and the 'new'.

The subject of my lectures is the Editorial Problem in Shakespeare—but this title needs a little explanation. The editing of Shakespeare, as of any other author, raises of course many problems. There is however, as I conceive, one critical need that is universal and fundamental, namely to determine the nature and authority of the text or texts in which an author's works have come down to us. Until that has been established, or until we have at least reached some hypothesis that for the time being satisfies us, we can hardly begin to consider what were the actual words he wrote, much less what was the meaning he intended to convey. Such, at any rate, is the modern critical creed.¹ Consequently, by the editorial problem in Shakespeare I mean an inquiry into the nature and origin of the various early editions and into the kind of authority that can be attributed to them—in short into what Dr. Pollard has called 'The Foundations of Shakespeare's Text'.² It is, I submit, only after an editor has made up his mind clearly upon this question—or if certainty is unattainable has adopted some considered if provisional view—that he is in a position to set about his business of establishing the text with a reasonable chance of success, or at least of arriving at a logically consistent result. We need not however confine our inquiry too narrowly to what will be of ultimate value to an editor, but may take account of all editions, however devoid of textual value themselves, that have something to tell us of the early history of the plays they purport to contain.³

¹ It was in fact stated as early as 1790 by Malone when he wrote: 'though to explain and illustrate the writings of our poet is a principal duty of his editor, to ascertain his genuine text, to fix what is to be explained, is his first and immediate object: and till it be established which of the ancient copies is entitled to preference, we have no criterion by which the text can be ascertained' (*Variorum* 1821, i. 202-3). On which Dover Wilson comments: 'This is admirable; and had editorial theory and practice only followed along the path thus opened up, all might have been well' (*The Manuscript of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet'*, i. 4).

² British Academy Annual Shakespeare Lecture, by Alfred W. Pollard, 1923; reprinted in *Aspects of Shakespeare*, 1933.

³ I have here in mind the 'bad' quartos. The sense might no doubt be extended to cover early quarto reprints, since these at least witness to a play's popularity, and a few may even illustrate its fortunes on the stage (like the late 'players' quartos of

This kind of textual study is really quite modern. Many critics have in the past, of course, expressed opinions more or less confident, the result of less or more experience, upon a number of individual questions;¹ but the systematic investigation and critical consideration of the subject began not much more than thirty years ago, and much of it has been done in the last fifteen. Both the recognition of the need for such an investigation and its achievements so far have been the result of a fresh approach to textual problems, an approach that has been and I think may properly be described as 'bibliographical', since it lays stress upon the material processes of book-production, concerning itself primarily with the fortunes of the actual pieces of paper on which the texts were written or printed, and the vagaries of scribes and compositors, rather than with the literary characteristics of the texts in question. Bibliographers have in fact brought criticism down from the fascinating but too often barren heights of aesthetic and philosophic speculation to the concrete familiarities of the theatre, the scrivener's shop, and the printing house. As soon as the new point of view suggested the formulating of new questions, all sorts of neglected facts took on significance, and in response to new demands whole new fields of evidence were discovered and explored. It soon came to be recognized that the form and fashion of literary and theatrical documents, the operation of agencies of production and transmission, and many other relevant circumstances, raised questions that were to be answered, not out of the critics' inner consciousness, as had been the fashion hitherto, but in accordance with whatever historical evidence

Hamlet). That however is a matter that lies outside the scope of these lectures. Now and again we come across a reprint, such as the third quarto of *Richard III*, 1602, or the fourth of *Romeo and Juliet*, n.d., that seems to have received some editorial supervision, though it is unlikely that this involved reference to any independent source. But so far as I am aware the subject has not yet received systematic attention, while the possible value of derivative editions forms no essential part of the editorial problem and can hardly be discussed in a general survey such as the present. Some remarks on the texts in the curious group of 1619 reprints will be found at pp. 132 ff.

¹ The most penetrating of the earlier critics was P. A. Daniel, whose introductions to several of the quarto facsimiles produced by Griggs and Praetorius under the general supervision of F. J. Furnivall in 1880-9 are still of value.

lay to hand or could be discovered by properly directed research. We are only at the beginning of this investigation, and may look forward to attaining in the course of time—if time be granted us—results more far-reaching and above all more securely based than any we have hitherto achieved. Still, I think no one will deny that the change of outlook is in itself significant, or that the positive results obtained since the beginning of the century, and in particular since the last war, are impressive; and it may not be an inopportune moment at which to pause in our exploration and survey the advance already made good, to map out as it were, in respect to Shakespeare, the textual landscape as it lies unrolled before us today. The distance we have travelled from what was once the attitude of orthodox criticism may be measured by turning to the prefaces of the old Cambridge editors and noting for instance how, after a piece of textual reasoning upon the order of the quartos of *King Lear* that would have done credit to any modern critic, they not only refused to draw the required inference but declared that the question of priority 'is very difficult to decide, and at most is one rather of bibliographical curiosity than of critical importance'.

When in 1709 Nicholas Rowe produced what is commonly if perhaps rather incorrectly regarded as the first 'edited' text of the plays, he based it on the fourth folio of 1685. It is true that he purported to have compared 'the several editions' and so given 'the true reading', rendering 'very many places intelligible that were not so before'; but this large claim does not altogether stand up to investigation. He restored over a hundred lines, including the bulk of one scene, from a late quarto of *Hamlet*, and the prologue from a quarto of *Romeo and Juliet*. Beyond this the evidence suggests little more than occasional and haphazard reference to an earlier edition.¹ Whether his choice of the latest seventeenth-

¹ See D. Nichol Smith, *Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century*, 1928, pp. 32-3, 40; R. B. McKerrow, *The Treatment of Shakespeare's Text by his Earlier Editors, 1709-1768*, British Academy Annual Shakespeare Lecture, 1933, pp. 8-10, 32-3. Nichol Smith writes: 'In the play of *Henry V* there are more than twenty passages where he has restored the reading of the First or Second Folio; and there are other passages in this play where he gives the reading, not of a Folio, but of a Quarto. In *King*

century edition as the basis of his text was determined by anything but convenience we do not know, but no doubt he could have defended it if challenged. For in fact the process of editing had begun as early as the folio of 1632 and had continued in each successive reprint:¹ there had not only been a progressive modernization of the spelling and punctuation, but also a general clearing away of original misprints and at least some attempt at emendation in passages believed to be corrupt.² In choosing as his basis the folio of 1685 Rowe was but availing himself of the labours of his predecessors; he did no more than what those earlier anonymous editors had done before him, and what most of his famous successors would do after him. That he frankly accepted the folio tradition as authoritative 'Shakespeare' can hardly be a matter of surprise, for could he not point to the assurance given by Shakespeare's fellow actors and first editors?³—

It had been a thing, we confess, worthy to have been wished, that the author himself had lived to have set forth and overseen his own writings; but since it hath been ordained otherwise, and he by death departed from that right, we pray you do not envy his friends the office of their care and pain to have collected and published them; and so to

Lear his use of one of the Quartos is unquestionable.' McKerrow on the contrary seems to have underestimated Rowe's editorial diligence and overestimated his critical insight. He questions whether the agreements between Rowe's text of *Henry V* and the quarto are due to anything but coincidence. It is indeed impossible to be certain. There can however I think be no doubt of the use of F1, for there are half a dozen agreements in passages in which there is nothing evidently wrong with the reading of F4, and two or three in which the emendation is by no means obvious. In *Lear* there are two readings that conclusively prove the use of a quarto (probably Q3, 1655), namely 'launcht' for 'latch'd' at II. i. 54, and 'coyning' for 'crying' at IV. vi. 83. *Launch*, in the sense of pierce, seems to have been already obsolete in Rowe's time, and 'coyning' is surely past guessing. (The second of these Rowe might have taken from Nahum Tate, but not apparently the first.) These readings moreover are supported by others less striking. I am indebted to Professor Nichol Smith for information concerning them.

¹ See p. 155. Of course the first folio was itself an edited text, on which a quite surprising amount of labour had been expended.

² That the weeding out of original misprints had been accompanied by the sowing of a fresh crop, and that the emendations were sometimes unnecessary and often erroneous, were facts that Rowe no doubt failed to realize.

³ Of course, printing from the fourth folio Rowe included seven plays (first added in the third) whose presence in the canon was not guaranteed by the original editors. What is said above is intended to apply to the text.

have published them, as where before you were abused with divers stolen and surreptitious copies, maimed and deformed by the frauds and stealths of injurious impostors that exposed them, even those are now offered to your view cured and perfect of their limbs, and all the rest absolute in their numbers as he conceived them. Who, as he was a happy imitator of nature, was a most gentle expresser of it: his mind and hand went together; and what he thought, he uttered with that easiness that we have scarce received from him a blot in his papers.

Now this has of course been represented as no more than a publishers' or editors' advertisement, to which no attention need or should be paid. To the question of the real meaning of its phrases I shall return: let it for the moment suffice to say that while we may need somewhat to discount their claim (particularly in the matter of Shakespeare's unblotted papers) there is no reason to reject it out of hand, or to hold the writers to have been other than indifferent honest as publishers and editors go. In that case it may well be asked whether Rowe was not essentially right, and whether we should not wisely follow his example. May not we too accept the folios—the first rather than the last—as the authoritative repository of Shakespeare's text, and so at one stroke immeasurably simplify what I have called the editorial problem?

The short answer to this is that the editors, who boasted, or allowed the printer to boast on the title-page, that their texts were 'Published according to the true original copies', were nevertheless content to take over several of them without material alteration from earlier quartos.¹ It is clear that in their preface Heminge and Condell were not writing with the precision we should expect from a modern editor, and that some deduction at any rate will have to be made from the claim of their collection to be the sole repository of the genuine text of Shakespeare. This of itself precludes any easy solution of the editorial problem and at once throws open to critical censure the whole range and variety of early

¹ The exact meaning that should be attached to the statement is, I think, that the texts of the plays had either been printed from or verified by comparison with play-house manuscripts. Thus interpreted it is probably substantially true, though it will not bear pressing in every case.

editions. That we should go further and say that Heminge and Condell were deliberately reviling as 'stolen and surreptitious' and as 'maimed and deformed' the very editions from which they had derived many of their own texts, and in consequence that their testimony is altogether unworthy of credence, is a proposition that has been very generally maintained in the past; yet it seems to any considerate judgement so outrageous, that critics might have been expected to show some caution about entertaining it, and long ago to have recognized that at any rate here was a problem worth investigation.

Actually it is no more than thirty years since Dr. A. W. Pollard, bringing the mind of a trained bibliographer for the first time to bear upon the wider problems of Shakespeare's text, succeeded in solving the enigma, and established what I imagine every reasonable person now recognizes to be the true sense of what Heminge and Condell wrote. The traditional view, with its contradictions and confusions, is well exemplified in the following passage from Malone:¹

Fifteen of Shakespeare's plays were printed in quarto antecedent to the first complete collection of his works, which was published by his fellow-comedians in 1623. . . . The players, when they mention these copies, represent them as mutilated and imperfect; but this was merely thrown out to give an additional value to their own edition, and is not strictly true of any but two of the whole number; *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and *King Henry V.*—With respect to the other thirteen copies, though undoubtedly they were all surreptitious, that is, stolen from the playhouse, and printed without the consent of the author or the proprietors, they *in general* are preferable to the exhibition of the same plays in the folio; for this plain reason, because, instead of printing these plays from a manuscript, the editors of the folio, to save labour, or from some other motive, printed the greater part of them from the very copies which they represented as maimed and imperfect, and frequently from a late, instead of the earliest, edition; in some instances with additions and alterations of their own.

Thus, according to Malone, Shakespeare's fellows were dishonest enough to advertise as 'cured and perfect of their limbs' the texts that they had reprinted verbatim from the

¹ Preface to his edition of Shakespeare, 1790; *Variorum* 1821, i. 203.

'maimed and deformed' quartos of 'injurious impostors'; and yet he accepted without hesitation their assurance that these were indeed 'stolen and surreptitious copies', though his critical sense warned him that they generally contained better texts than the folio. There is surely something wrong here.

The crux of the matter, as Pollard was quick to perceive, lies in the exact meaning of the word 'divers'—'you were abused with divers stolen and surreptitious copies'. Did the writers mean merely 'sundry' copies, and did they intend to include in their condemnation all the quarto editions of the plays that had hitherto appeared, as Malone thought; or did they mean 'certain' specific copies only, namely those containing texts notoriously 'maimed and deformed' (such as those instanced by Malone) as Pollard now proceeded to argue? If the former, then Shakespeare's friends and fellows were clearly disingenuous in their advertisement: if the latter, then they may have been perfectly honest in claiming that they had replaced these corrupt texts by others 'perfect of their limbs', and moreover they cannot in that case be cited as casting the slur of illegitimacy upon the quartos as a whole.

Anyone who desires a lucid and convincing argument on these questions should read for himself the third chapter of Dr. Pollard's monumental work on the early editions of Shakespeare, published just thirty years ago to accompany the Methuen facsimiles of the four folios.¹ But Pollard's case can be quite briefly stated, and I will endeavour to do so.

He was not of course the first to observe that some of the quarto texts were very much worse than others: Malone,² as we have seen, singled out two, and any competent critic of modern times could have indicated, at least in a general way, those especially worthy of condemnation. Sidney Lee, in the

¹ *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos, a study in the bibliography of Shakespeare's plays, 1594-1685*, 1909. The true interpretation of the passage in question had in fact been pointed out exactly fifty years before (and curiously enough in the year of Pollard's birth) by Tycho Mommsen in the introduction to his parallel-text edition of *Romeo and Juliet*; but he did not make his argument specific, and it seems to have escaped notice. See G. I. Duthie, *The 'Bad' Quarto of 'Hamlet'*, 1941, p. 4, note 2.

² Capell in 1768 already had a general idea of the distinction (*Variorum* 1821, i. 121).

course of an orthodox denunciation of all early quartos as 'stolen and surreptitious', instanced six as notably defective, while admitting that in eight others comparatively few faults were visible. But it was Pollard who first clearly distinguished between what he called the 'Good Quartos' and the 'Bad Quartos' as constituting two well-differentiated classes, and it was his great merit to perceive the implications of this distinction. It is true that today we can no longer endorse some details of his classification, but I think it was probably a fortunate accident that in his original and now classic exposition he was led somewhat to over-simplify the problem, and thus avoided blurring the sharp outline of his argument in a way that might have interfered with its general acceptance.

Before the appearance of the first collected edition of Shakespeare's plays in 1623, seventeen of those now included in the canon had, according to Pollard's count, been separately published in quarto, two of them, namely *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet*, each in two widely different versions, making nineteen texts in all. Five of these common opinion holds to be thoroughly bad: the earlier *Romeo and Juliet* (1597), *Henry V* (1600), *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (1602), the earlier *Hamlet* (1603), and *Pericles* (1609). It used to be thought that some at least of these were original versions of plays subsequently revised, first drafts as they were commonly called: modern criticism, on the other hand, inclines to regard them as essentially derivative texts corrupted from more authoritative versions through some kind of reporting.¹ So far as the present argument is concerned it does not much matter which view we take: suffice it that they were all alike printed with a view to passing them off as the genuine Shakespearian plays, while in fact they were inferior texts,

¹ As the term is used in textual criticism the distinctive feature of a 'report' is that it has passed through a memorial stage. Thus a perfect shorthand version of a performance would be a report of the author's original in virtue of its having been transmitted through the memories of the actors; so would a reconstruction of the text by the actors themselves: a version patched up by a spectator from recollection of what he had heard on the stage would be doubly reported, having passed first through the memories of the actors and then that of the spectator. (Hansard is not a report in this sense.)

recognizable as such not only by comparison (except in the case of *Pericles*) with the corresponding folio versions, but absolutely according to the standard of the remaining quartos.

The novel feature in Pollard's argument was the demonstration that the issue of each of these five 'bad' quartos was in some way peculiar: *Romeo and Juliet* and *Henry V* were not entered in the Stationers' Register at all; *Hamlet* and *Pericles* were published by stationers other than those who had made the entrance; *The Merry Wives* was entered by one stationer and transferred to another the same day. On the score alike of internal and external evidence, therefore, there is some ground for regarding these texts as piracies, that is as 'stolen and surreptitious' in the words of Heminge and Condell. The 'bad' texts of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet* were superseded by 'good' quartos within a couple of years of their publication; those of *Henry V* and *The Merry Wives* were superseded by 'good' ones in the first folio; that of *Pericles* was never superseded, being excluded from the folio altogether. Thus no use was made by the editors of the folio of any of the 'bad' quartos.

The other fourteen quartos are classed as 'good'. Their quality varies, it is true, but they are sharply marked off from the texts we have just been considering. If in a few cases they are inferior to the corresponding texts in the folio, it is mainly through comparison with these that their defects become apparent: examined by themselves they may indeed reveal corruptions—as also do the folio texts—but these are not of a kind to excite serious doubt of their authenticity—at least no serious doubt was in fact entertained by so able an editor as Malone. Most of them are probably neither better nor worse than the texts of those plays that were printed in the folio for the first time. Their bibliographical origin is uniformly respectable. With three exceptions they were regularly published by stationers who had made normal entrances in the Company's Register; and the three exceptions are of the kind in which we may see confirmation of the rule. The 'good' quartos of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet* were issued to replace the 'bad' quartos previously published,

and for them no entry was apparently deemed necessary;¹ while the quarto of *Love's Labour's Lost*, published without entry in 1598, bore on its title-page the words 'Newly corrected and augmented' and was probably also issued to replace a 'bad' quarto now lost. Most of these fourteen 'good' quartos were used with more or less correction by the editors of the folio. The only one they quite certainly did not use is *Hamlet*, which is curious seeing that it had been specially issued to replace a 'bad' text. Pollard actually understated his case, for he assumed with earlier critics that the folio editors also neglected the quartos of 2 *Henry IV*, *Troilus and Cressida*, and *Othello*, whereas in fact it seems possible that they used two out of the three. At the same time their treatment of the quarto texts varied widely, and a rough division can be made into two groups: those namely that were reprinted with little or no alteration (like 1 *Henry IV* and the 'good' *Romeo and Juliet*, which they reproduced almost verbatim) and those that underwent substantial alteration (like *King Lear*, which they revised throughout, and *Titus Andronicus*, to which they added a whole new scene).

Thus we have, on Pollard's showing, a very pretty scheme, which stands as follows:

five quartos with notoriously bad texts; all published in suspicious circumstances; all rejected by the editors of the folio:

fourteen quartos with at least comparatively good texts; all published either after normal registration with the Stationers' Company, or else certainly or probably to replace 'bad' quartos; all but two (perhaps) used as the basis at least of the folio texts by the editors of 1623.

This is an impressive argument; but as I hinted before, further investigation has tended, not indeed to invalidate it, but somewhat to blur the symmetry of its outline. For one thing, it has been pointed out that absence of registration is not in itself evidence of piracy nor always accompanied by textual corruption; nor is simultaneous entrance and transfer proof of dishonest dealing. Many plays published without

¹ *Hamlet*, 1604-5, though published by Ling was printed by Roberts, whose entrance of 1602 was still valid.

entry in the Stationers' Register contain perfectly normal texts, and some can be shown to have been legitimately obtained. On the other hand, some pieces that were quite regularly entered prove to have thoroughly bad texts. Thus Pollard failed to take account of two plays, known as *The First Part of the Contention between York and Lancaster* and *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York*, which are quarto versions corresponding to the Second and Third Parts of *Henry VI* as printed in the folio. He held—as we most of us did thirty years ago—that these were source plays like *The Tragical Reign of King John* and *The True Chronicle History of King Lear*. This view is now generally rejected, and the texts published in 1594 and 1595 are classed with the other 'bad' quartos. Neither was used as the basis of the folio text, and in so far these cases support Pollard's argument; but *The First Part of the Contention* was quite regularly entered in the Register, and though no entrance was made of *The True Tragedy*, it may have been thought covered as a sequel.¹ Again, not all the 'good' quartos have, according to the latest theory, quite so respectable an origin as Pollard allowed them. This applies particularly to *King Lear*. Unless I am mistaken, and what would be more surprising Sir Edmund Chambers is equally and independently so, the text of the quarto of 1608, though on a very different level of accuracy from those of the recognized 'bad' quartos, is like these a report based on actual performance, and therefore

¹ In his latest account of the matter (a chapter on 'Shakespeare's Text' contributed to *A Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, Cambridge University Press, 1934) Pollard accepts the addition of these two texts to the list of 'bad' quartos, and makes it the basis of a very pretty argument. He points out that the 'bad' *Romeo and Juliet*, which had never been entered, and the 'bad' *Hamlet*, which had been printed in defiance of Roberts's entrance, were promptly superseded by authorized texts; whereas the *Contention* plays, one of which was regularly entered, *The Merry Wives*, the entrance and transfer of which, however suspicious, were perfectly valid, and *Henry V*, of which Pavier had secured an apparently valid though highly suspicious transfer, were none of them superseded till the publication of the folio many years later. This suggests that the entrance and printing of an inferior and stolen text could be used to prevent the publication of an authorized edition, a possibility to which I drew attention in 1925 in an article on "'The Spanish Tragedy'—A Leading Case?' (*The Library*, vi. 47). (But see addenda, p. 182.) The symmetry of the argument is again a little upset, this time by the fact that the 'bad' *Pericles* was never superseded, though there was apparently nothing to prevent it. Perhaps, as the play was only in part Shakespeare's, it was not thought worth retrieving.

presumably piratical and surreptitious. Yet it was quite regularly entered in the Stationers' Register, and I have no doubt myself—though it has been questioned—that Pollard was right in supposing it to have been used in printing the folio text.¹ This is unquestionably damaging to his case: at the same time it should be observed that the editors only used this quarto after it had undergone extensive revision, so that they might well claim that it had indeed been cured and made perfect.

It must be admitted that the neatness of Dr. Pollard's argument 'by what used to be called in Logic the method of Agreement and Difference' has suffered somewhat with the advance of knowledge, and recent criticism does not see the details of the evidence quite as he saw them thirty years ago. Nevertheless, he has been held, and I think after all deductions have been made quite rightly held, to have proved his case. No one has any longer the right to maintain that Heminge and Condell abused as 'stolen and surreptitious copies, maimed and deformed by the frauds and stealths of injurious impostors' the very texts they were themselves reprinting in their edition. Their strictures should be taken to apply only to a specific class of notoriously inferior texts, and these they replaced by good ones. Not only is the essential honesty of Shakespeare's friends and fellows vindicated, but the stigma under which the quartos as a class have laboured is removed. There is no reason to believe that the manuscripts from which the quartos of Shakespeare's plays were printed were not for the most part honestly obtained in the ordinary course of business.

The traditional view established by Malone invoked the authority of the folio to discredit the quartos generally, at the same time discrediting the folio for its dishonest use of these same quartos. This left the foundations of Shakespeare's text dubious and insecure. We now believe that the folio editors never meant to assert that the quartos as a whole were

¹ *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos*, p. 53. He was here basing his view on Daniel's. Later he appears to have forgotten this and to have reverted to the view of the Cambridge editors. Thus on p. 110 he says that the folio text was 'Printed from MS.', and he develops this opinion on p. 121.

stolen and surreptitious, and that there was nothing dishonest or in the main uncritical in their use of them. This however of itself hardly touches the question of the absolute quality or authority of the texts. It was all very well for Heminge and Condell, anxious for the success of their venture, to represent the collection as 'Published according to the true original copies' and to protest that in it the author's works 'are now offered to your view cured and perfect of their limbs, and . . . absolute in their numbers as he conceived them': we know that for about a third of the plays they relied, with more or less revision, on previously printed editions differing perhaps much in authority, and for the rest on manuscripts for the originality of which we have only their own word. Criticism would be failing in its function if it refrained from inquiry into the nature of the texts, alike of those plays that were printed for the first time in the folio and of those reprinted from quartos; while even respecting the texts that the editors rejected curiosity at least may allow some speculation.

On the whole Heminge and Condell approached their task in a manner that inspires confidence, however much we may regret some details of their procedure. Not only did they utterly reject the 'bad' quartos, but they evidently subjected even the 'good' quartos to critical inspection, and treated those of which they made use in very different ways.¹ Of most plays it is evident that they had at their disposal manuscripts which they believed to contain texts superior, or at any rate in some way preferable, to those previously published, and that they used these manuscripts freely to modify the texts of the quartos. Indeed, it might be true to say that in these instances they made use of the quartos merely for convenience of printing and intended to bring their texts into complete agreement with the manuscripts, though they never succeeded in carrying out this intention

¹ This must not be taken too literally. How far Heminge and Condell were individually responsible for the editing of the first folio we have no means of knowing. We can only speak of what was done under their general authority. After all, they signed both 'The Epistle Dedicatory' and the address 'To the great Variety of Readers', and it is therefore convenient to regard them as in charge of the venture. See further, pp. 153 ff.

to the full. For some plays, on the contrary, they appear to have been satisfied with the quartos as they stood, and allowed them to be reprinted with only such alteration, if any, as a knowledge of playhouse custom or a superficial reference to playhouse documents might suggest. It has been thought that some of the folio texts were set up from copies of quartos that had themselves been used as prompt-books in the theatre and contained notes added by the prompter. This is possible, though in most instances the evidence in favour of the hypothesis seems to me doubtful, and I am on the whole inclined to reserve judgement.¹

It follows from what I have just said that although we might divide the plays in the folio according to the actual copy (manuscript or print) sent to press, a more significant classification will be one that groups them according as (1) they were printed for the first time, (2) they were printed in a form materially different from that in which they had already appeared, implying that the editors had access to what they considered a better text (whether the actual copy sent to press was a manuscript or a quarto corrected by a manuscript), and (3) they were reprinted from a quarto without material alteration. Thus classified the contents of the folio are as follows.

(1) Plays not previously printed (eighteen, or exactly half the collection) namely:

Comedies² (nine—again half): *The Tempest*, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Measure for Measure*, *The Comedy*

¹ I doubt whether a prompter, accustomed to a manuscript 'book' with fifty to eighty lines on a page, would have found much convenience in a printed quarto of about half the size. There is, I believe, unpublished evidence for the use of printed quartos as prompt-books in provincial companies (see addenda, p. 182), and one actual quarto that has been annotated for stage use probably belonged to such an organization (see *A Looking-Glass for London and England*, Malone Society reprint).

² The folio classification into Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies, though generally followed (as above) is not perfect. *Cymbeline* is a romance on the same lines as *The Winter's Tale* and its appearance among the Tragedies is unexplained. *Troilus and Cressida* is a doubtful case. It was inserted at the last moment between the Histories and the Tragedies (and does not appear in the Catalogue): it is certainly not a History (which means a play based on English history) and must therefore have been intended to belong to the section of Tragedies (it was originally meant to follow *Romeo and Juliet*). It can hardly be called a comedy, though the preface to the quarto speaks of it as such.

of *Errors*, *As you Like it*, *The Taming of the Shrew* (taking this to be a different play from a *Shrew*), *All's Well that Ends Well*, *Twelfth Night* or *What you Will*, *The Winter's Tale*;

Histories (three): *King John*, 1 *Henry VI*, *Henry VIII*;

Tragedies (six): *Coriolanus*, *Timon of Athens*, *Julius Caesar*, *Macbeth*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Cymbeline*.

(Out of fourteen Comedies only five had previously appeared; out of ten Histories, seven; out of twelve Tragedies, just half.)

(2) Plays reprinted in substantially different form (twelve—I give them in the chronological order of the quartos):

Titus Andronicus, 2 *Henry VI*, 3 *Henry VI*, *Richard II*, *Richard III*, *Henry V*, 2 *Henry IV*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, *Troilus and Cressida*, *Othello*.

(One half of these are Histories.)

(3) Plays reprinted without material alteration (six):

Romeo and Juliet, 1 *Henry IV*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *Much Ado about Nothing*, *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*.

(All but two are Comedies.)

The plays printed in the first folio number thirty-six: modern editions contain thirty-seven. The additional piece is of course *Pericles*. This is one of seven that were added to the second issue of the third folio in 1664; they comprise three plays (including *Pericles*) that had been printed in Shakespeare's lifetime with his name on the title-page, three that had similarly appeared with his initials, and one to the second edition of which his name had been added three years after his death, though a false date on the title-page lent it specious authority. It must be admitted that Philip Chetwind, the publisher of the third folio, was not altogether without excuse in making his additions to the canon, though in fact he can have known very little about the plays he was reprinting. With the exception of *Pericles* they are all rejected by modern critics: one of them we know, on the authority of the man who paid for it, to have been written by four minor dramatists for a company that was not Shakespeare's. It is solely on internal grounds that editors today recognize parts of

Pericles as having come from Shakespeare's pen, and it is safe to say that they would never have gone so far as to include the play in the canon had it not been for Chetwind's example, whose authority in the matter they at the same time implicitly deny. It certainly has no better claim to inclusion than *The Two Noble Kinsmen*.¹

There is, then, no longer any excuse for regarding the majority of the quartos of Shakespeare's plays that preceded the collection of 1623 as the offspring of piracy and deception. I should add that there is not the slightest reason to suppose that Shakespeare himself supervised the printing of any of them, though I am pretty sure that he must have had a part, if only as a leading member of the company, in placing copy at the disposal of the publishers, and I have sometimes wondered whether the solicitude shown in superseding the 'bad' quartos of *Hamlet*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and probably *Love's Labour's Lost*, may not have been his. Dr. Pollard has used his wide knowledge of the conditions of the Elizabethan book trade to argue that, while piracy might be an occasional nuisance, it is extremely improbable that the members of a powerful organization, such as was the Lord Chamberlain's company under Elizabeth and still more the King's company under James, were generally unable to protect their property or likely to acquiesce tamely in the infringement of their rights.² Into this wide and at times difficult and debatable field I cannot enter: suffice it to say that on a thesis necessarily indefinite and incapable of formal proof, Pollard has I think established as strong a presumption as we could expect. The overwhelming probability is that the copy for all but two or three of the quartos generally classed as 'good' came from the playhouse and was acquired

¹ On the possible reasons for the exclusion of *Pericles* from the first folio see the note at the end of this lecture, p. 19. Its present position in the canon is apparently due to Richard Farmer, the author of *The Learning of Shakespeare*. Rowe printed all seven additional pieces from the fourth folio; Pope and his successors excluded them; but in his edition of 1790 Malone once again admitted *Pericles* at Farmer's suggestion. It has been suggested that Chetwind originally intended to add *Pericles* alone, seeing that it has separate signatures from the rest. This may be so, but it hardly lends any greater authority to the attribution.

² *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates and the Problems of the Transmission of his Text* (Sandars Lectures, 1915), second edition, 1920, pp. 35 ff.

with the approval of the company. That the copy for the plays first printed in the folio came from the playhouse is not seriously questioned. What this copy itself was like is another matter. Dr. Johnson once wrote of Shakespeare's dramatic works:¹

he sold them, not to be printed, but to be played. They were immediately copied for the actors, and multiplied by transcript after transcript, vitiated by the blunders of the penman, or changed by the affectation of the player . . . and printed . . . from compilations made by chance or by stealth out of the separate parts written for the theatre: . . . no other editions were made from fragments so minutely broken, or so fortuitously reunited. . . .

This flourish of rhetorical fancy,² which Pollard has described as containing 'the nearest approach to nonsense which the great Doctor ever made', was written some years before he edited the works in question and need not be taken very seriously. Unfortunately it is but the extreme expression of a common belief, and in spite of some demurring on the part of Malone,³ Johnson's words no doubt helped to colour and distort the outlook of subsequent editors and critics. An attitude of textual pessimism, fostered in recent times by Sidney Lee, had long been traditional when Pollard blew the trumpet of revolt. Perhaps never has so conservative a spirit led so revolutionary a crusade. For not content with arguing the playhouse origin of the great body of Shakespearian texts, he went so far as to suggest that some of them at least may have been printed from the very manuscripts of the author. Before however we can profitably discuss this theory it will be necessary to turn our attention to the actual documents that have come down to us from the Elizabethan playhouses, and consider what light they throw upon the question of the sort of copy that may be supposed to have lain behind the various early editions of Shakespeare's plays.

¹ *Proposals for printing, by subscription, the Dramatick Works of William Shakespeare*, 1 June 1756, pp. 3-4: quoted by Malone in the preface to his edition, 1790; Variorum 1821, i. 196. A facsimile reprint of the only known copy of the original was issued by the Oxford University Press in 1923.

² We may agree with Johnson's own remark that 'It is not easy for invention to bring together so many causes concurring to vitiate a text'!

³ Variorum 1821, i. 201.

NOTE ON 'PERICLES'.—It is no part of my intention to discuss the authenticity of the Shakespearian canon, but the exclusion of *Pericles* from the first folio in 1623, though it belonged to the King's company and had been already four times printed with Shakespeare's name, raises a problem in regard to the editing of the collection that cannot be altogether ignored. Three explanations have, I believe, been suggested, and though none of them is altogether satisfactory, I do not know what other could be advanced. They are: (1) that Heminge and Condell excluded the play on the ground that it was not, or was only in part, by Shakespeare; (2) that they were prevented from including it by considerations of copyright; (3) that they recognized the printed version as belonging to the group of 'bad' quartos they were determined not to use, and that they possessed no authoritative text with which to replace it. I will deal with these alternatives briefly.

(1) The folio editors were in the very best position to know the facts concerning the authorship of any play in the company's stock, and may be supposed to have applied their knowledge to the best of their ability in the task they had undertaken. We need not of course conclude that they intended to guarantee that every line they printed had come from Shakespeare's pen, or on the other hand that every line he had ever written for the stage was to be found in their collection. Nor need we credit them with omniscience. By 1620 the ultimate facts concerning plays that dated back a quarter of a century or more and had probably come from another company may well have been forgotten, but in regard to pieces written for the King's men within the last ten or twelve years there can have been no possible doubt. Yet it is difficult to square their selection with critical opinion today. The plays immediately in question are of course *Henry VIII*, *Pericles*, and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* each of which the weight of modern opinion assigns in part, but only in part, to Shakespeare; yet the first of these the editors admitted into their collection while excluding the other two. Of course, we may take our stand on the editors' authority and deny the validity of modern criticism. This is the easiest solution, and it has found favour in some quarters. It may follow either of two lines, holding that *Henry VIII* is wholly Shakespeare's while only parts (if any) of *Pericles* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* are from his pen; or else that *Henry VIII* is at least partly his and that he had no hand in the others. To my mind the manifest presence of two very different styles in *Henry VIII*, not linked with any difference of subject matter, together with the external evidence of dramatic association between Shakespeare and Fletcher in 1612 and 1613 afforded by *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and the lost *Cardenio*,

makes it impossible to regard *Henry VIII* as Shakespeare's unaided work. Since then by a like argument, in addition to the testimony of the title-page, *The Two Noble Kinsmen* is equally the product of collaboration on Shakespeare's part, the problem would by no means be solved by declaring that critics were mistaken in finding Shakespeare's hand in *Pericles*, which moreover I am sure they are not.

(2) There seems to be nothing in the suggestion that difficulties over copyright were the reason for exclusion. Edward Blount, one of the publishers of the first folio, had himself entered the play in the Stationers' Register in May 1608. It is true that he had not had it printed, that it may not have been the extant version (if we believe Chambers's ingenious argument) and that he may have forgotten all about it (since *Antony and Cleopatra*, which he entered at the same time, was re-entered in 1623).¹ On the other hand, the extant version had been issued twice in 1609 by one Henry Gosson, who dealt mostly in ballads and had not troubled to enter the play at all; it had been reprinted in 1611 by Simon Stafford, a shady printer, who had even less right to the copy, and again in 1619 for Thomas Pavier, a rather unscrupulous publisher, who had if possible less claim still. There could be no question of copyright here, and if Heminge and Condell were able to supersede a bad text by a good one in the case of *Henry V*, to which Pavier had at least a *prima facie* claim according to the rules of the Stationers' Company, they could certainly have done so in the case of *Pericles* had they wished.²

(3) That the difficulty lay in finding a good text to substitute for the bad is a much more attractive possibility, which I should be glad enough to entertain. From the form of Blount's entry we can infer that it was the prompt-book itself that was sent to Stationers' Hall for registration.³ If this had been accidentally lost or destroyed it would account at once for Blount's failure to get it printed, for a pirate's eagerness to issue a reported version of a popular play, and for the inability of the folio editors to produce an authoritative text. Even revivals in 1619 and 1631 would raise no serious difficulties, since though the prompt-book had perished the actors' parts would remain, and the printed text was perhaps in sufficient agreement with these to

¹ Anyhow it would be unwise to lay stress on Blount's entrances. In both an 'R' after the sum paid has been deleted. The letter presumably indicated that the fee had been duly received, and it is at least possible that its deletion was equivalent to the cancellation of the entry. This would explain the re-entrance of *Antony and Cleopatra*. But the point is not really relevant.

² Of course it might be argued that they came to terms with Pavier over *Henry V* and failed to do so over *Pericles*, but nothing is to be gained by *ad hoc* conjectures.

³ See p. 106.

regulate the performance. Nevertheless I think the hypothesis should be rejected. The play entered, if it was the one we now have, must have been quite new in 1608, for that is the very earliest year in which Shakespeare can be supposed to have written his part; and if the prompt-book of a new and successful play had been destroyed, steps must at once have been taken to replace it, either by preparing a fresh one from the authors' rough copy, or failing this, reconstructing it (now if ever!) from the actors' parts. Furthermore, there seems, on Chambers's showing, some reason to doubt whether the play registered in May 1608 was Shakespeare's at all, in which case there is no ground for supposing that the Shakespearian prompt-book was ever in jeopardy.

It would seem therefore that the reason for the exclusion of *Pericles* from the first folio must remain uncertain. The most likely explanation, it seems to me, is that the editors did not intend to include in their collection plays that were not substantially Shakespeare's, and that they therefore omitted *Pericles* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, but that they made an exception in favour of *Henry VIII* in order to round off the series of Histories.¹

¹ A somewhat similar explanation may account for the presence of 1 *Henry VI*, of which most critics assign only a few scenes to Shakespeare, since by 1620 it had no doubt come to be regarded as an integral part of the trilogy, whatever doubts the editors may have had of its authorship.

II. THEATRICAL MANUSCRIPTS

BEFORE proceeding further with our inquiry into the nature of the manuscripts that were used as copy for the early editions of Shakespeare's plays, and thus of necessity entering upon a region of inference and conjecture, it will be well to set a limit to possible exuberance of imagination by summarizing what we know, from actual examples that have survived, concerning the manuscripts in use in the Elizabethan playhouses previous to the civil war, and other play-transcripts of the time. We have, in fact, a considerable body of evidence at our disposal, and it is within the framework of this evidence that we are bound to confine conjecture if it is to be other than vain imagining. It is strange how this fact has been disregarded until quite recently, and how ready even the most reputed of critics have been to rely upon uncontrolled intuition. When Johnson penned the imaginative description of playhouse manuscripts already quoted, he perhaps never dreamed that any of these had survived to refute him: he at least did not deliberately ignore evidence that lay to hand. No such excuse could be pleaded by Sidney Lee, who stated that the characteristic marks of an authoritative playhouse manuscript were 'complete divisions of a play into acts and scenes, stage directions, indication of "the scene," and lists of *dramatis personae*'.¹ Actually, two of these features are almost uniformly absent, divisions were only gradually introduced, and in regard to stage directions great variety prevails.

We have for our guidance nearly a score of manuscripts that may either be classed as prompt copies or at least show some definite evidence of playhouse use. Perhaps as many more are of a generally similar nature but exhibit no signs of theatrical origin; while an indefinite number of others occasionally throw light on particular problems, though their interest is for the most part literary rather than dramatic. Thus there are possibly half a hundred playbooks from which we may hope, in one way or another, to learn

¹ Introduction to the Clarendon Press facsimile of the first folio, 1902, p. xix.

something to our purpose. Besides these there survive a few dramatic documents of other kinds, of which I shall have a few words to say in conclusion.¹

¹ The following are the references for manuscripts of plays mentioned in the text (all are at the British Museum unless otherwise stated):

Aglaura, by Sir John Suckling, 1638, MS. Royal 18 C. xxv.

Barnavelde, *Sir John van Olden*, 1619, MS. Add. 18653, ed. W. P. Frijlinck, Amsterdam, 1922.

Believe as you List, by P. Massinger, 1631, MS. Egerton 2828, ed. C. J. Sisson, Malone Society, 1928.

Bonduca, by J. Fletcher, c. 1625, MS. Add. 36758.

The Captives, by T. Heywood, 1624, MS. Egerton 1994(3), ed. A. C. Judson, 1921.

Charlemagne, or the Distracted Emperor, c. 1605?, MS. Egerton 1994(6), ed. J. H. Walter, Malone Society, 1938.

The Court Secret, by J. Shirley, c. 1642?, Worcester College, Oxford.

Demetrius and Enanthe (= *The Humorous Lieutenant*), by J. Fletcher, 1625, Lord Harlech, ed. A. Dyce, 1830.

Edmond Ironside, or War hath Made all Friends, 1590-1600?, MS. Egerton 1994(5), ed. E. Boswell, Malone Society, 1928.

The Elder Brother, by Fletcher and Massinger, c. 1630-40, MS. Egerton 1994(1).

The Escapes of Jupiter (from *The Golden and Silver Ages*), by T. Heywood, c. 1625?, MS. Egerton 1994(4).

The Faithful Friends, by Beaumont and Fletcher?, c. 1625?, Dyce Collection, MS. 10, ed. A. Dyce, 1844.

A Game at Chess, by T. Middleton, 1624-5; (1) Trinity College, Cambridge, MS. O. 2. 66, (2) Huntington Library, (3) A. S. W. Rosenbach (another has recently been advertised by the Rosenbach Company), (4) Bodleian, MS. Malone 225, (5) MS. Lansdowne 690; see ed. R. C. Bald, 1929, and *M.L.R.*, 1930, xxv. 474.

Hengist King of Kent (= *The Mayor of Queenborough*), c. 1625-50, Folger Shakespeare Library, ed. R. C. Bald, 1938.

The Honest Man's Fortune, by Beaumont and Fletcher, 1625, Dyce Collection, MS. 9.

John a Kent and John a Cumber, by A. Munday, c. 1590?, Huntington Library, ed. M. St. C. Byrne, Malone Society, 1923.

John of Bordeaux, or the Second Part of Friar Bacon, by R. Greene?, 1590-1600?, Alnwick Castle, ed. W. L. Renwick, Malone Society, 1936.

The Lady Mother, 1635, MS. Egerton 1994(9), ed. A. H. Bullen, 1883.

The Launching of the Mary, or the Shipman's Honest Wife, by Walter Mountfort, 1633, MS. Egerton 1994(15), ed. J. H. Walter, Malone Society, 1933.

The Parliament of Love, by P. Massinger, 1624, Dyce Collection, MS. 39, ed. K. M. Lea, Malone Society, 1929.

The Queen of Corsica, by Francis Jaques, 1642, MS. Lansdowne 807(1).

The Royal Slave, by William Cartwright, 1636?, MS. Add. 41616(1).

The Second Maiden's Tragedy, 1611, MS. Lansdowne 807(2), ed. Malone Society, 1910.

Sir Thomas More, by A. Munday and others, c. 1593?, MS. Harley 7368, ed. Malone Society, 1911.

The Soddered Citizen, by John Clavell?, 1632-3?, E. C. Troyte-Bullock, ed. J. H. P. Pafford, Malone Society, 1936.

All playbooks in any way connected with the theatre are folios with as a rule upwards of fifty lines on a page. This means that the writing is sometimes rather crowded, but it had the advantage for the prompter of minimizing the turning over of the leaves and generally permitting him to keep an eye on business ahead. Every play performed had to be allowed by the Master of the Revels, and several of the manuscripts actually bear his licence at the end, while from others it has no doubt been lost. The so-called *Second Maiden's Tragedy* bears the allowance of Sir George Buc; *The Honest Man's Fortune*, *Believe as you List*, and *The Launching of the Mary*, that of Sir Henry Herbert; *The Lady Mother* that of Herbert's deputy, William Blagrave. From the end of *The Parliament of Love* Herbert's licence has evidently been cut out by some autograph hunter. *Barnavel* has annotations in Buc's hand and was certainly acted: it must have borne his allowance, and this may have been written on a separate leaf now lost. The same applies to *Charlemagne*, except that we have no record of its performance. Signs of censorship also appear in *Thomas of Woodstock* (the end of which is lost) and less certainly in *The Two Noble Ladies* and *The Welsh Ambassador* (from the end of each of which a leaf may be missing). *Sir Thomas More* has notes by Edmund Tilney, including a long one at the beginning, which has been read as a conditional licence but is rather a refusal to allow the play unless drastic alterations were made.¹ *John a Kent*, *John of Bordeaux*, and *The Sod-*

Thomas of Woodstock, or the First Part of the Reign of Richard II, c. 1592-5, MS.

Egerton 1994(8), ed. W. P. Frijlinck, Malone Society, 1929.

The Two Noble Ladies and the Converted Conjuror, 1622-3?, MS. Egerton 1994 (11), ed. R. G. Rhoads, Malone Society, 1930.

The Welsh Ambassador, c. 1623, Cardiff Public Library, ed. H. Littledale, Malone Society, 1921.

The Witch, by T. Middleton, c. 1620-7, Bodleian, MS. Malone 12, ed. (Isaac Reed) 1778.

Most of these manuscripts are described and their characteristics considered in my *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses*, 1931; see also the admirable chapter on 'The Book of the Play' in E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, 1930.

¹ It apparently ran: 'Leave out the insurrection wholly and the cause thereof, and begin with Sir Tho. More at the Mayor's sessions, with a report afterwards of his good service done being Shrieve of London upon a mutiny against the Lom-

dered Citizen, all apparently prompt-books, are imperfect at the end and may have lost their licences though they bear no marks of the censor's pen. The number of manuscripts that have the outward appearance of prompt-books but are unlikely to have passed through the censor's hands is small: the most interesting is *The Captives*, to which I shall return. We ought perhaps to allow for the occasional duplication of prompt copies.

Some of the manuscripts are in the hands of the authors, others in those of scribes. Massinger's *Believe as you List* is autograph, and so is Mountfort's *Launching of the Mary*. *John a Kent* and the original draft of *Sir Thomas More* are in the hand of Anthony Munday, who was probably the author of the one and at least part author of the other. *The Captives* and *The Escapes of Jupiter* (which however bears no marks of playhouse use) are in Thomas Heywood's. *Charlemagne* and *The Two Noble Ladies* appear, from internal evidence, to be in the hands of their unknown authors. On the contrary, *Barnaveli* was written by Ralph Crane, a professional scribe who is known to have worked for the King's men and has also left us four private transcripts of plays;¹ *The Honest Man's Fortune* was written by the book-keeper of the same company, whose name seems to have been Knight, and who also made a private transcript of *Bonduca* and prepared for the stage both Massinger's *Believe as you List* and Clavell's *Soddered Citizen*. *The Welsh Ambassador* and Massinger's *Parliament of Love* are in one hand, presumably that of a playhouse scribe. Unidentified scribal hands wrote *Thomas of Woodstock*, *Edmond Ironside*, *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*, and *The Lady Mother*. Thus it will be seen that among playhouse manuscripts autograph and scribal copies appear in about equal numbers.

bards, only by a short report and not otherwise at your own perils. E. Tilney.' There is no inscription at the end though the verso of the last leaf is blank. As an example of a normal licence may be cited: 'This second Maiden's Tragedy (for it hath no name inscribed) may with the reformatiōns be acted publicly. 31 October 1611. G. Buc.' Buc had himself made the reformatiōns in the manuscript. His allusion is of course to Beaumont and Fletcher's *Maid's Tragedy*, which had probably appeared not long before.

¹ See F. P. Wilson, 'Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players', *The Library*, 1926, vii. 194. He also transcribed Jonson's masque *Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue*.

From the evidence at our disposal we can follow pretty closely what must have been the manner in which an Elizabethan play was written—using the term Elizabethan very loosely to cover the English theatre from its inception as a public institution in the seventies to the outbreak of the civil war.¹ When an author proposed to write a play for a company with which he was associated, he probably first submitted some sort of scheme or outline for approval. Late in 1597 Ben Jonson was drawing money from the Admiral's men in earnest of a play of 'which he showed the plot unto the company', and the following autumn Chapman was paid for 'two acts of a tragedy on Benjamin's plot'. The natural inference is that Chapman was completing a play left unfinished by Jonson. A plot of this kind was all the more necessary that collaboration between several writers was the rule rather than the exception, at least in the companies financed by Henslowe: it must have included an outline of the story and probably some disposition of the action into scenes. We can guess something of what it was like from 'The plot of a scene of mirth to conclude this fourth act', which survives in the manuscript of *The Faithful Friends*, along with a text of the scene in question; and we also find a memorandum of the characters to appear in five scenes of the Second Part of *Henry Richmond* scribbled on the back of a note to Henslowe concerning the purchase of that play in 1599. From this note and from other allusions we learn that it was the custom for an author to read his finished play to the company, for Robert Shaa, one of the sharers in the Admiral's, writes: 'we have heard their book and like it; their price is eight pounds, which I pray pay now to Mr. Wilson, according to our promise.' In this instance the play was apparently paid for on completion, presumably when the clean copy was handed over. But this was unusual with the needy playwrights that haunted Henslowe's office. They commonly sought to obtain advances in earnest of their scenes as they produced them. We find unusually detailed information of such transactions in the correspondence

¹ The documents mentioned in the text will be found printed in my editions of *Henslowe's Diary*, 1904-8, and *Henslowe Papers*, 1907.

of Robert Daborne, whose letters the careful Henslowe preserved, whence they passed into the hands of his son-in-law Edward Alleyn, and now repose in the College of God's Gift that Alleyn founded at Dulwich.

Naturally an author would make a rough copy of a play first. Even the most fluent might find it difficult to produce straight off a manuscript suitable for the prompter, and the reparation of a fair copy would afford opportunity for adjustments suggested by the theatre and the exigencies of a particular cast. Such a rough copy seems to have been known as 'foul papers' or 'foul sheets' as opposed to the fair copy prepared for actual use on the stage. Daborne employs the term in writing to Henslowe, and a particularly interesting example of its use is found in the manuscript of Fletcher's *Bonduca*. This was written, probably about 1625, by the book-keeper of the King's company for a private patron. At one point a scene is missing, and the scribe adds a note to explain that 'the book whereby it was first acted from is lost, and this hath been transcribed from the foul papers of the authors which were found'. The inference is that these had been preserved in the archives of the company, perhaps in view of just such an accident.¹ The company may also have thought it prudent to keep in their own hands all existing copies of a play they purchased in order to safeguard themselves against dishonesty. Heywood complained that some authors made a double sale of their work, first to the actors and again to the printers;² and Greene had once been accused of selling the same play to two different companies.³

Such a rough draft Daborne must already have made at the time of his correspondence with Henslowe, and we find him struggling to prepare his fair copy for the theatre. He had read his play by instalments to Alleyn, and the whole had been approved by the company. He now promises that he 'will not fail to write this fair and perfit the book'—the 'book' being, then as now, the technical term for the prompt

¹ Chambers suggests (*William Shakespeare*, i. 125) that the papers may have been preserved 'in the hands of the author or his representatives'. They may, no doubt; but the suggestion seems to me just a little perverse.

² *The Rape of Lucrece*, 1600, address 'To the Reader'.

³ *The Defence of Cony-catching*, by 'Cuthbert Cony-catcher', 1592, sig. C3.

copy. But the work proceeded slowly. He will deliver 'three acts fair written', sends 'two sheets more fair written', sits up 'till past twelve to write out this sheet', and again sends 'two sheets more, so that you have ten sheets' in all. Sheets mean whole foolscap sheets of four folio pages and would contain between two and three hundred lines. This piecemeal delivery explains why the majority of prompt-books are made up of a succession of numbered sheets and not gathered into quires after the fashion of most manuscripts. We get a vivid glimpse of the harassed playwright: 'Mr. Henslowe, you accuse me with the breach of promise: true it is I promised to bring you the last scene; which that you may see finished, I send you the foul sheet, and the fair I was writing, as your man can testify; which if great business had not prevented, I had this night finished.' On this occasion at least Daborne handed over his foul papers, but only that they might be transcribed in the playhouse to save time or else returned to him to finish: whether as a rule he delivered the foul sheets with the fair there is nothing to show.

That any actual foul papers such as Fletcher's and Daborne's survive we cannot tell for certain, but we may get an idea of what the pages of rough copy probably looked like by examining the carelessly written additions that we find in some theatrical manuscripts, for instance *Sir Thomas More*, *The Faithful Friends*, and Shirley's *Court Secret*—very different from the beautifully neat insertions made in the prompt-books of *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* and *Barnavelt*. It is possible that an actual fragment of foul copy survives in the manuscript of a scene from Marlowe's *Massacre at Paris* now in the Folger Shakespeare Library at Washington.¹ It is an odd-shaped piece of paper, about two thirds of a folio leaf, that can never have formed part of a regular play-book, and it contains a fuller and better text than that in the very corrupt printed edition. Since no authenticated example of Marlowe's handwriting is known, it is impossible to say whether the fragment is autograph. There is no internal indication.

Actually, I am inclined to believe that among the manu-

¹ See J. Q. Adams, 'The "Massacre at Paris" Leaf', *The Library*, 1934, xiv. 447.

scripts that would naturally be classed as prompt-books, there is one that may more properly be regarded as foul papers, namely Thomas Heywood's play *The Captives*. It is true that this does not at first sight look like a rough draft. But writers no doubt differed greatly in fluency, in their capacity to achieve at once the desired expression of their thoughts, and in their proneness to alter or touch up what they had first set down. The tribute that Heminge and Condell paid to Shakespeare's facility is familiar: 'His mind and hand went together; and what he thought, he uttered with that easiness that we have scarce received from him a blot in his papers.' They had then Shakespeare's autographs, or some of them, in their possession when they prepared their collection of his works, and if their testimony is to have any significance we must suppose that these were rough drafts rather than fair copies.¹ Recent criticism however is inclined to discount their statement; and certainly the three pages which Shakespeare is supposed to have contributed to the 'book' of *Sir Thomas More*, though fluently written, are not without alterations. The publisher Humphrey Moseley no doubt had the words of Heminge and Condell in mind when he wrote almost a quarter of a century later:²

Whatever I have seen of Mr. Fletcher's own hand is free from interlining, and his friends affirm he never writ any one thing twice: it seems he had that rare felicity to prepare and perfect all first in his own brain, to shape and attire his notions, to add or lop off, before he committed one word to writing, and never touched pen till all was to stand as firm and immutable as if engraven in brass or marble.

This is reported at second hand, but again Moseley claims to have seen some of Fletcher's own manuscripts. I think that once more piety has exaggerated the poet's readiness of composition. A comparison of Fletcher's foul papers in *Bonduca* (as copied by the scribe) with the recovered prompt-book (as printed in the folio of 1647) suggests that an appreciable amount of revision took place, and there is no proof that this

¹ This point was made with proper emphasis by Pollard: *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates*, 1920, pp. 59-60.

² Address by 'The Stationer to the Readers' in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647.

was not done by Fletcher himself—certainly, if the book-keeper was responsible, he did not regard the words of that rather facile author as graven in brass or marble.

Nevertheless, we may easily believe that either of these dramatists, or indeed any fluent and practised writer working on a detailed and carefully considered sketch, could have at once achieved, had he wished, a text as straightforward and free from alterations as are some of the prompt copies that survive. Such a writer was, we may assume, Thomas Heywood, who boasted having had at least a main finger in more than two hundred plays,¹ and whose writing, seldom rising above a moderate level of competence, is at the same time uniformly easy and unstrained. His play *The Captives* contains very little original alteration and is tidily if illegibly written, and since it has been elaborately cut and annotated by the book-keeper,² evidently with a view to performance, it is not surprising that it should have passed as a prompt-book. There are, however, three considerations that militate against this conclusion. (1) While we know that the play was licensed by Herbert on 3 Sept. 1624, it bears no trace of his endorsement though the last page is blank and no leaf is missing. (2) It is written in an execrable hand, which would have made it hard for the censor to read and almost impossible to prompt from. (3) Even more significant is the fact that the book-keeper's annotations are almost as badly written as the text, from which no attempt is made to differentiate them. It seems to me impossible that such a manuscript should have been intended as the official 'book'. It is, I believe, a manuscript handed in by the author and carefully annotated by the book-keeper, not with a view to itself serving as a prompt copy, but for the guidance of the scribe by whom the 'book' was to be prepared. If so, the manuscript would fall technically into the category of foul papers. Whether there was ever behind it a rougher draft we shall presumably never know, nor is it a question of much importance, but in view of the character of the author and the nature of the play there is, I think, no need to assume it.

¹ Epistle to *The English Traveller*, 1633.

² On the functions of the book-keeper or prompter see the appendix (p. 158).

The kind of prompt-book that might have been produced, had the manuscript of *The Captives* been handed over to a scrivener for transcription, may be seen in *The Welsh Ambassador*. This is written throughout in one scribal hand, including what are evidently the prompter's annotations, such as 'Set out a table' and directions for 'Flourish' and 'Hautboys'. These are not markedly differentiated from the text, though clear enough for practical purposes, and they might almost as well have been transcribed from another manuscript as added to the copy that survives. This is in contrast to such a manuscript as *Believe as you List*, in which the author's fair copy has been carefully prepared for the stage by the book-keeper, or to *The Honest Man's Fortune*, essentially the same in style, but written throughout in the book-keeper's hand. In these the main concern of the annotator was to get the essential directions for the action inserted and clearly distinguished from the text. The same governing consideration may be traced in *Barnaveli* and rather less clearly in *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*. The three manuscripts last mentioned are all fine work, and Knight, Crane, and the anonymous third scribe, are the great playhouse scriveners connected with the King's company in the first half of the seventeenth century.

I have used the terms 'foul papers' and 'rough draft' indifferently in contradistinction to the fair copy made for theatrical purposes but with no intention of implying a preliminary or imperfect sketch. The foul papers must have contained the text substantially in the form the author intended it to assume though in a shape too untidy to be used by the prompter. Exactly how definitive the text was would no doubt depend to some extent on whether the author intended to prepare the theatrical fair copy himself or hand over his papers for transcription in the playhouse. If the latter, then his draft would need to contain his final touches and the text appear exactly as he meant it to stand: if he was going to copy it out himself, then no doubt he might reckon on doing a certain amount of revision in the process, though it would still be desirable to indicate as much as possible on the foul papers in order to produce a perfectly clean fair copy. It

is true that if a writer was careless or was likely to be taking part in the production of the play,¹ he might be inclined to leave minor points to be cleared up by the book-keeper or to determine themselves in rehearsal, in which case his foul papers would present a less finished appearance. In general however, except for such carelessness and other oversights of the author and for alterations called for by the stage-manager, we should expect foul papers to contain the text of a play substantially in its final form.

We have seen Daborne preparing his own fair copy to serve as the 'book' of the play. Whether this was the rule or the exception it is difficult to tell. We have also seen that the playhouses have provided us with autograph and scribal copies in about equal numbers, but we cannot always be certain which are prompt-books or how far these are typical. Heywood's *Captives* is, I have just argued, a rough copy. Massinger's *Believe as you List* is exceptional. It was not prepared from foul papers at all, but from the fair copy of an earlier version that the censor had on political grounds refused to license, and there is some indication that the necessary revision was done by the author in the actual course of transcription.² If the alterations were extensive, but not excessively so, this was no doubt the most economical procedure. None of the other pieces by Massinger that have survived in manuscript are autograph. Nothing can be argued from Mountfort's absurd play on *The Launching of the Mary*. It is amateur propaganda on behalf of the East India Com-

¹ We know curiously little about the person who in the Elizabethan playhouse exercised the function of what we call the 'producer'. (This term of course is quite modern. It was unknown to the *O.E.D.* in 1905, and the earliest quotation in the Supplement is of 1909. Before that production came under the stage-manager. It seems possible that in Elizabethan times the book-keeper was responsible.) It is only natural to suppose that Shakespeare, as a leading member of the company, at least exercised some control over the production of his own plays. At the same time Dover Wilson has shown I think that the prompt copy of *Hamlet* can have owed nothing to his direction (*The Manuscript of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet'*, i. 170-4). He suggests that Shakespeare may have been away from London at the time. That is of course possible, but he is credited (by Rowe) with having himself played the Ghost.

² At one point (l. 634) Massinger inadvertently retained the original name of a character 'Dom Sebastian', which the book-keeper duly altered to 'King Antiochus'.

pany, and we can only suppose that the Company subsidized the performance. For this the author's rough draft could be made to serve: it was so untidy that Herbert, though he licensed it, demanded a fair copy. In the circumstances we may doubt whether he got it. This rather reduces the number of normal autograph prompt-books, but there remain the two plays in Munday's hand, *John a Kent* and *Sir Thomas More* (original version), and the two supposedly autograph 'books' of *Charlemagne* and *The Two Noble Ladies*.

Of plays written in collaboration by two or more authors the fair copy, unless prepared in the playhouse, would most naturally be written throughout by one or other of them. This is what very likely happened in the original version of *Sir Thomas More*, for though the whole is in Munday's hand, it seems probable that he had received assistance from one or two of the playwrights who were later concerned in the revision. More certainly the product of collaboration is *Barnavel*, generally ascribed to Massinger and Fletcher, but this exists only in a transcript by Crane.

To sum up this part of the discussion. It was perhaps more usual for the prompt-book to be prepared by a professional scribe in the playhouse than by the author (or one of the authors) personally, but either procedure was recognized. If the author handed over his foul papers for transcription, they were sometimes at any rate preserved in case of accident to the prompt-book; and even if he prepared his own fair copy it is possible that the company demanded the production of the foul papers as a precaution against underhand dealing, though this is little more than a conjecture. Either the foul papers or the fair copy might be edited by the book-keeper with a view to production, and the fair copy would later be submitted for licence. The less likely it is that the prompt-book of a particular play was in the hand of the author, the more likely that the company possessed his rough draft. Thus it is possible that the company would have in its archives at least one autograph copy of any play in its repertory. We have the word of Heminge and Condell that the King's men possessed some of Shakespeare's own manuscripts, including foul papers, and it is hardly stretching the

evidence to assert that they possessed some of Fletcher's too. There is, then, nothing fantastic in the suggestion that if the sharers authorized an edition of one of their plays it might be printed from a manuscript in the author's own handwriting.

It will be useful to have some idea what a prompt-book was like in appearance. All known examples are what we should call foolscap folios, consisting of a number of sheets sewn or stabbed together and written on both sides of the leaf. Some are still enclosed in vellum wrappers on which the title appears. An early example is inscribed 'The Book of Iohn A kent & Iohn a Cumber', a later one 'A new playe Call'd: Beleeue as you List: Written By m^r Mæssenger May 6th 1631'. The prompt-book was sometimes at least kept in the folded 'plot' of the play, for one of the extant plots (of which I shall have a word to say later) is endorsed 'The Booke and Platt of the second part of The .7 deadly sinns'. If the licence is preserved it is written at the end below the finis. As a rule each leaf was folded vertically twice over so as to make four equal columns. In the first were written the speakers' names: verse would about fill two of the others, prose would extend across all three. The more important stage directions, especially entrances constituting a new scene, were written across the page, sometimes between rules; other directions were generally written in the right margin if there was room, and so were all exits. The entrance of a minor character is often only indicated by adding 'Enter' to the speech prefix. Speakers' names are usually abbreviated, but the practice varies: Massinger tends to write them in full, while on some pages of *Thomas of Woodstock* they are reduced to an initial. A scribe would often write a page of text first and add the speakers' names later: this tended to produce bad alinement, but ambiguity was generally avoided by the practice of drawing short lines on the left separating the speeches. As a rule the text was written in an English 'secretary' hand, proper names and directions in Italian script; but scribes differed in the care with which they observed the distinction, and the difference between the two styles tended to disappear as the seventeenth century advanced.

There are three features of playhouse manuscripts that are of immediate interest to textual students, namely the marking of acts and scenes, the nature and disposition of the stage directions, and any evidence there may be of editing or revision. On each of these I must say a few words.

I should first remark that on the Elizabethan stage scene division is structural and act division conventional. A new scene begins whenever the stage is left empty (unless there is continuity of action) and so long as the directions are clear it is always possible to determine where one scene ends and another begins, whether or no the scribe has supplied a formal indication. Scene division, then, is an obvious and inevitable feature of dramatic construction, and there was the less need to stress it in the 'book'. Often there is no indication at all, sometimes a line is drawn across the page; but unless there is also a division into acts the scenes are not numbered.¹ On the other hand, an author may write without any regard to the division of his play into acts: if he wishes such a division to be made it is essential that he should draw attention to it. If he gives no indication, any division introduced by a scribe can claim only playhouse convenience, and any introduced by subsequent editors can only be conjectural.

The great majority of prompt-books have some sort of division. Of eighteen manuscripts that can by a stretch be assigned to this class, sixteen are as they stand divided into acts, and just half of these have the scenes also marked and numbered. The only two left wholly undivided are *Sir Thomas More* and *John of Bordeaux*, both early pieces, the former of which was probably never performed. But in two other 'books', both early, the division has been introduced later: *Edmond Ironside*, originally undivided, was subsequently divided into acts, and *Thomas of Woodstock*, in which at first only two scenes were marked, acquired a full division into acts and scenes. *Charlemagne* and *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*, perhaps the next oldest, are divided into acts only;

¹ When in *Thomas of Woodstock* the scribe wrote the headings '(i) Sceane' and '2 sceane' he may have expected a full act division, though this was in fact only supplied by the book-keeper. Several manuscripts have a heading 'Actus primus, Scena prima' or the like where the division is into acts only, but none in which there is no division at all.

the earliest 'book' fully divided by the original scribe is probably *Barnaveli* in 1619. It is interesting to notice that in this manuscript the insertion of a scene has led to the re-numbering of others in Act III. In *Believe as you List* Massinger's own careful division into acts and scenes was altered by the book-keeper, who incidentally twice made the note 'Long' opposite an act division to indicate an extended pause: in *The Lady Mother* the divisions were altered by the original scribe. In *The Launching of the Mary* and *Hengist King of Kent* the numbering of the scenes is very imperfect. The evidence therefore goes to show that after about the beginning of the seventeenth century plays were usually divided into acts. All pieces belonging to the King's men are so divided, but the earliest of these is probably *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* of 1611, already near the end of Shakespeare's career.

With regard to stage directions the chief lesson to be learned from the prompt-books is caution. It has often been suggested, perhaps chiefly on *a priori* grounds, that an author writes literary directions in the indicative, the prompter technical ones in the imperative, and that a reporter is more elaborately descriptive. I believe that this is true in a general way, though the categories are neither so easily recognized nor so logically distinguished as is sometimes thought. I fancy that the descriptions of a reporter, reproducing things seen at a performance, can sometimes be distinguished; but there is no doubt that an author's own directions frequently take a descriptive form. They would presumably become less so as his association with the stage grew closer and his opportunities of controlling production increased. Moreover any professional playwright would quite naturally slip into using the technical language of the stage and write, for instance, 'above' or 'at several doors'. Such phrases have therefore very little evidential value. Most distinctive of an author are indefinite or permissive directions like 'Enter four or five citizens', 'A boy the least that can play', 'A song if you will', 'Either strikes him with a staff or casts a stone'. A reporter might be vague about number but hardly about action. Directions of this type it would be the business of the book-keeper to make definite. In casting and producing the

play it will be determined how many 'supers' can be allowed, who is the smallest boy available, whether a song is required, and what particular action will be most effective on the stage.

The prompter writes directions for his own use; they are generally terse and to the point. Chambers questions whether they are usually in the imperative. They are not: but being short and curt they tend to imperative and participial constructions, if any—'Knock', 'Sound sennet', 'Bar brought in', 'A flourish'. When a book-keeper annotates an already written manuscript he often duplicates directions by rewriting them in a heavier style and more conspicuous position, as well as perhaps in terser form; and such repetition might easily lead to conflation in a printed text. We find many instances of this in Shakespeare's plays, and they afford clear evidence of the prompter's hand. Again, an author may of course demand properties—Massinger in *Believe as you List* calls for 'the records' or chronicles of Carthage—but only the book-keeper can specify a particular property—as when for these same records he orders the production of 'the great book of accounts', no doubt the company's ledger. It has been pleasantly suggested that when in *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* the folio adds the direction 'Enter Piramus with the ass head', we see the book-keeper specifying what was no doubt the only ass's head in the company's stock.

There are, then, types of direction indicative of the author and the book-keeper, but even so they do not always serve clearly to define the nature of the manuscript in which they occur. As already remarked, an author familiar with the playhouse may use technical theatrical terms in his directions: on the other hand, a book-keeper will sometimes write directions of a more literary flavour, such as 'Drum afar off'. But besides this, it must be remembered that the book-keeper's object in annotating a manuscript is to clarify and emphasize rather than systematically to replace the author's directions. If these will serve his purpose he may leave them standing though they are not couched in the words he would himself use. He may even be careless and not trouble to make specific such a direction as 'with two or

three Lords attendant'.¹ We must therefore be prepared to find authorial directions occasionally surviving in a prompt-book. On the other hand, in reading through an author's draft the book-keeper may jot down notes for future guidance, so that the presence of some playhouse directions does not prove that the manuscript in which they occur was actually used on the stage.

It has often been supposed that a characteristic of a prompt-book is that entrances are marked some lines too early, the suggestion being either that the prompter required to see that the characters were ready to take their cues, or else that they had to be got onto the stage ahead of their cues so that they could advance and join in the dialogue at the right moment. The needs are in fact quite different, and neither affords a very satisfactory explanation. Whether a character can be in view of the audience before he is seen by the other characters on the stage depends entirely on the situation;² whereas, if an actor was not on the spot to make his entrance, two or three lines would afford no sufficient time in which to fetch him. In point of fact such anticipation of entries is not, I believe, a general feature of prompt-books; but it does sometimes occur. In *Believe as you List* when the book-keeper duplicates an entrance in the left margin he enters it two or three lines earlier than the original direction, but he draws a rule to indicate the exact point where it belongs. This I think disproves the theory that the character was really intended to enter ahead of his cue. It appears to have been the prompter who needed warning of action ahead. Actually there would seem to be no need for such anticipation, since the direction if boldly written, as it usually was, could easily be picked out by the eye. That this was the essential consideration is shown by a peculiar feature that appears even in manuscripts that do not

¹ In annotating Heywood's manuscript of *The Captives* the book-keeper left untouched the direction 'Either strikes him with a staff or casts a stone' (iv. iii, fol. 68^a). Presumably he had not made up his mind.

² The extraordinary frequency of such phrases as 'Here comes so-and-so', evidently intended to inform the audience of the identity of the person entering, makes it quite certain that as a rule the characters on the stage became aware of his presence immediately he appeared.

normally anticipate. A direction at or near the head of a verso page could not of course be seen until the leaf was turned, and in a number of instances the direction has been transferred to, or repeated at, the foot of the preceding page. In one remarkable case the book-keeper actually transferred a couple of lines of text together with the direction for a song from the top of a verso to the previous recto so that he might turn over the leaf at his leisure while the song was being sung.¹ Such transference would of course account for occasional instances of previous or even duplicated entries in printed texts. And in general anticipatory entries probably do point to prompt copy, though we must not expect them to be a constant feature of plays printed from playhouse manuscripts.

The need to see that actors were in readiness, though it is not met by anticipatory entries, was recognized in some prompt-books by the addition of warnings some considerable distance ahead. *The Welsh Ambassador* is full of notes of the sort: 'be ready Penda' (20 lines before 'Enter Penda like a common soldier'), 'be ready Penda and Voltimar above' (some 25 lines before Carintha 'shows Penda with a leading staff: Voltimar at his back: his sword in him'), 'be ready Carintha at a table' (25 lines before the required discovery). A few also occur in *Believe as you List*, for example: 'Gascoine: & Hubert below: ready to open the trap-door for Mr. Taylor' (about 100 lines later). Such warnings however are exceptional, and they do not of course usually find their way into printed editions: nevertheless we have '2. hearses ready with Palamon: and Arcite: the 3. Queens. Theseus: and his Lords ready' in the quarto of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, 1634,² and 'The bar & book ready on a table' in *The Spanish Curate* in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647.

The names in the direction just quoted from *Believe as you List* are of course those of actors (or stage-hands) and the manner of their appearance would at once stamp the manuscript as a prompt-book. It has indeed been almost univer-

¹ *Believe as you List*, fol. 20.

² The punctuation suggests that the annotator was the scribe with whose work we are familiar in *Believe as you List* and elsewhere. *The Two Noble Kinsmen* of course belonged to the King's men.

sally assumed that the presence of actors' names is a distinctive feature of prompt-books; but this view has of late been challenged by Allison Gaw and McKerrow.¹ Names of actors have undoubtedly been added by the book-keeper in prompt copies, but it is pointed out that they are usually those of minor actors written opposite or above the designations of subordinate characters in such a manner as would tend to duplication in printing.² When therefore we find the name of a well-known actor not duplicating but substituted for that of a character, it is suggested that we should rather see the hand of the author himself writing a particular part with a particular actor in view. This seems to me plausible, and the inference is sometimes borne out by other features that point to autograph copy. It is true that it is unsupported by any evidence in the extant manuscripts, in which all actors' names are added by the book-keeper; but to this it may be replied that it is in the foul papers that the author's use of actors' names would appear, and that they would probably be eliminated in the course of preparing the prompt-book.

Lastly we come to the difficult question of alterations. The importance of these lies in the evidence they may afford concerning the practice of revision, which is a favourite hypothesis with a certain school of critics. The assumption of wholesale revision made by writers like Fleay, J. M. Robertson, and Dover Wilson, was traversed by Sir Edmund Chambers in his essay on 'The Disintegration of Shakespeare',³ in which he sought to reduce the practice to its true proportions. That prompt-books contain many passages deleted or at least marked for omission,⁴ and less

¹ See 'Actors' Names in Basic Shakespearean Texts', *PLMA*, 1925, xl. 530; and 'The Elizabethan Printer and Dramatic Manuscripts', *The Library*, 1931, xii. 274. The suggestion was anticipated by R. Crompton Rhodes, *Shakespeare's First Folio*, 1923, p. 57. This book contains some acute observations, but it is maddeningly inaccurate and full of statements for which there is no sufficient evidence.

² The manuscript most notable in this respect is *Barnavel*, which contains the names or initials of ten different actors.

³ British Academy Annual Shakespeare Lecture, 1924, reprinted in *Aspects of Shakespeare*, 1933.

⁴ The usual method marking a passage for omission was to draw a line down the margin, but often the text is also crossed off with varying thoroughness. A com-

frequently other passages substituted or inserted, is perfectly true; but there is as a rule no evidence that these alterations were not made in the course of preparing the play for the original production. The additions on carefully inserted slips that are a feature of *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* obviously belong to the original preparation of the 'book'. Those in *Barnavel* are also in the same hand as the original text, and the scene numbering has been adjusted to their insertion. Sometimes the cuts were made in obedience to the censor or else to anticipate his objections. It was evidently to meet his criticisms that the author undertook the extensive rewriting traceable in *The Launching of the Mary*—and in any case a revival of the play is unthinkable. The revision in *Believe as you List* was of course due to Herbert's refusal to license the original version. On the other hand, the presence of actors' names sometimes proves that a play was revived at a later date, and it is of course possible, and occasionally probable, that alterations found in the manuscript were made on that occasion. It is uncertain whether the marginal additions that make the 'book' of *The Lady Mother* rather untidy are in the hand of the original scribe or not: they may be later, but we cannot tell. *The Court Secret* is interesting in this connexion, since not only has the manuscript been to some extent altered and revised (involving a change in the name of a principal character) but the play was again revised and indeed largely rewritten before being printed as Shirley's in 1653. But it was then said never to have been acted, so that the revision cannot have been made with the object of refurbishing an old play for revival, which is the hypothesis usually advanced, but must rather be regarded as part of the original act of composition. The manuscript shows no signs of having been used in the theatre.

Thus the extant manuscripts afford no evidence of any wide-spread tendency to alter plays once they had appeared on the stage. Chambers has shown from the records of Henslowe and Herbert that while revision did sometimes occur it was comparatively infrequent. Moreover, in most

positor would be likely to treat the two cases differently, printing the passages merely lined while omitting those more heavily scored.

cases it appears to have consisted in the provision of prologues and epilogues and the insertion of fresh scenes rather than in any wholesale alteration of the text; though one instance of the reduction of a two-part play to a single piece is definitely known. We may safely assume that the sort of textual revision that would force the book-keeper to provide and the actors to learn a complete new set of parts would not be popular in the theatre.¹

It is of course *Sir Thomas More* that is usually cited as an example of theatrical revision, and upon which has been built the theory of what is called 'continuous copy', according to which an old play-book might undergo almost any amount of alteration, cancellation, and addition, and still remain in use as a prompt copy. Now the whole history of this play is extremely complicated and obscure, and it is very difficult to reach any conclusions about it that shall be sufficiently certain to be made the basis of further argument. It has unquestionably undergone very extensive revision: it was also submitted to the censor, who returned it with a note refusing licence unless drastic changes were made. But it is uncertain whether Tilney saw it before or after revision. His few marginal comments are confined to the original sheets, and I find it a little difficult to believe that he would have read it in its present chaotic condition. On the other hand, the revision makes no attempt whatever to meet the censor's demands. Moreover, in spite of the fact that at one point an actor's name has been attached to a revisional speech, it is highly improbable that the play was ever acted, so that once again we are concerned with the stage of composition rather than with revision proper. As to 'continuous copy', if we assume that the play did not reach performance we are in no position to say what would have happened if it had. In spite

¹ Ben Jonson revised the text of several of the plays included in the folio of 1616, notably that of *Every Man in his Humour*. But it is not known whether the revision was made for the stage or for publication. (Chambers is inclined to believe that the play was altered for a revival at court in 1605; Simpson thinks the later version was made in 1612 in preparation for the folio. The fact that the folio text was actually printed from a corrected copy of the quarto perhaps favours the latter.) It is possible that Jonson in publishing his Works acted as did the closet dramatists. Samuel Daniel, the Earl of Stirling, and Lord Brooke, all revised their plays, sometimes more than once.

of some care shown in fitting the various sections of revisional matter into the original manuscript; others were not properly incorporated at all, and it would have been almost impossible, one would think, for the prompter to have made use of the book. And even if it had not been necessary to make a fair copy for the stage, it would undoubtedly have been necessary to make one for licence, assuming the play to have been originally submitted in the unrevised form. When *Believe as you List* (if that was the original title) was revised to meet Herbert's objections, a fresh manuscript was prepared; and Herbert even demanded a fair copy of *The Launching of the Mary*. No doubt Sir Henry was a fussy man and stricter than his predecessors: still, to have resubmitted *Sir Thomas More* as it stands and bearing Tilney's original comments would have been an act of inconceivable folly. The theory of 'continuous copy' is, I am convinced, a figment of the editorial brain.¹

The basis of the theory appears to be an exaggerated belief in the unwillingness of actors to multiply copies of their plays. That they would naturally be careful in this respect may be admitted. Piracy was a reality, and Shakespeare's company, like others, suffered from it. But in fact all known piracies appear to be reported texts, and I am not aware of any instance of a dramatic manuscript being stolen for publication. Nor do I believe that piracy was ever a very serious matter. Wherein did its sting lie? Was it that the printing of a play interfered with its attraction on the stage?² or that the company thereby lost the fee that a publisher would have paid? or that it made the piece accessible to rival organizations? It is true that so long as a play was new the company might imagine that publication would reduce its drawing power (though this is really doubtful) but its novelty would probably have worn off by the time a pirated version was

¹ It is of course conspicuous in Dover Wilson's textual introductions in the new Cambridge Shakespeare, but it already formed a main feature of the argument in a series of articles on 'The "Stolne and Surreptitious" Shakespearian Texts' that he and A. W. Pollard contributed to *The Times Literary Supplement* in 1919 (9, 16 Jan., 13 Mar., 7, 14 Aug.).

² Or can it have been that the appearance of a mangled version of a play was a bad advertisement?

obtained and printed, and the consideration could hardly apply to a revival. The few shillings that a publisher would have paid for a manuscript can have been no matter of consequence to a thriving company. The ordinary price for an old play in the theatre was two pounds in Henslowe's day, and it is probably significant that this was the very sum that the Admiral's men paid Cuthbert Burby in 1600 to stop the printing of *Patient Grissil*. I do not suppose the Chamberlain's men got much more. Of course once a play was printed it might be difficult to prevent other companies from acting it, but there seems in fact to have been very little theatrical poaching in London,¹ and provincial companies seldom came into competition. Pollard and Wilson, the inventors of 'continuous copy', are curiously enough the very critics who have most stoutly maintained that the actors did in fact often sell plays to the press once their first popularity was over. There is, moreover, evidence, though of a somewhat later date, that the King's men allowed transcripts of some of their plays to be made for sale. Against this must be set the fact that they sought the Lord Chamberlain's protection against the unauthorized printing of their plays in 1619 and again in 1637.² Still, it is difficult to believe that the danger was sufficiently pressing to have governed their whole policy in respect to manuscripts. Nor can the trouble and expense involved in making fresh copies have been great enough to lead them to put up with the serious inconvenience of illegible prompt-books.

The practice of making copies of plays for sale, to which I have just alluded, is mentioned by Moseley in his preface to the Beaumont and Fletcher collection of 1647:

When these comedies and tragedies were presented on the stage, the actors omitted some scenes and passages (with the author's consent) as occasion led them; and when private friends desired a copy, they then (and justly too) transcribed what they acted.³

¹ In the spring of 1627 the Red Bull company had to be restrained from performing Shakespeare's plays, and the King's men paid Herbert five pounds to do it (G. E. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 1941, i. 270).

² See Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, i. 136.

³ Moseley adds: 'Heretofore when gentlemen desired but a copy of any of these plays, the meanest piece here . . . cost them more than four times the price you pay

It is difficult to say when the practice began, but no very early examples are known. Chambers thinks that it may not have been till after the Lord Chamberlain's intervention in 1619. I am not aware that any private transcript can be dated before 1624, when the scandal over *A Game at Chess* created a sudden demand, but it is quite possible that isolated copies may have been produced earlier. Of Middleton's play no less than six manuscripts have come down to us, of which one is autograph and two are in the hand of Ralph Crane. Crane produced two other transcripts about the same time: Fletcher's *Demetrius and Enanthe* (called *The Humorous Lieutenant* in the folio) was copied for Sir Kenelm Digby and dated 27 Nov. 1625, and Middleton's *Witch* is probably not later than 1627. It was also most likely about 1625 that Knight, if that was his name, made his transcript of *Bonduca* apparently for a private owner. Cartwright's *Royal Slave* and Suckling's *Aglaura*, both of which may be copies made for presentation to the king on the occasion of performance at court, are about ten years later. A still more literary production is an undated manuscript of *The Elder Brother* by Fletcher and Massinger, at the end of which several miscellaneous poems have been added.

One or two manuscripts may possibly have been edited with a view to printing. On a blank page in the prompt copy of *The Two Noble Ladies* another hand has written a detailed head-title¹ and a list of dramatis personae; a rather similar addition to *The Faithful Friends* may be an eighteenth-century production, but *The Queen of Corinth*, a literary manuscript of 1642, also has a list of personae.² A list giving the names both of characters and actors is a unique feature in the prompt copy of Clavell's *Soddered Citizen*.

Two other classes of documents deserve a word in conclusion: actors' parts and theatrical plots.³ The parts were

for the whole volume.' From this I imagine the usual charge for a transcript of a play to have been about five pounds.

¹ 'The Two Noble Ladies: A Tragicomical History, often times acted with approbation at the Red Bull in St. John's Street, by the Company of the Revels.'

² So indeed has the prompt-book of *The Welsh Ambassador*.

³ These are discussed at length in my *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses*. Alleyn's part of Orlando is at Dulwich. So is the plot of *The Seven*

naturally prepared from the author's fair copy or the prompt-book. They are once mentioned in the Daborne correspondence from which I have already quoted. Of one of his plays he writes: 'I have took extraordinary pains with the end, and altered one other scene in the third act, which they now have in parts.' If playwrights were in the habit of altering their scenes after the parts had been prepared it must have been extremely inconvenient; but perhaps we are to understand that Daborne had supplied the parts for the altered scene himself. Whether that was usual we do not know, nor whether the parts were commonly prepared piecemeal as the copy came in. It would seem to be a foolish practice, only to be excused on the score of haste; but we do happen to know that the equally improvident habit of preparing them before the play had been licensed was at least not unknown. Herbert complained of it: 'Purge their parts, as I have the book', he wrote on one occasion to Knight of the King's men, and at the same time he made a memorandum to the effect that 'The players ought not to study their parts till I have allowed the book'.¹ Only one actor's part from an Elizabethan play has come down to us, that of the title-role in *Orlando Furioso*. One could wish that it had survived from a more interesting play, but it at least shows that Greene's piece was not quite such miserable stuff as it appears in the printed quarto—*Orlando Foolioso* as Harington called it. The part belonged to the famous Edward Alleyn and has been corrected in his own hand. It consists of a long paper roll, composed of strips pasted end to end, and is written on one side only. Several of the strips have the name of the character written at the top: there are short cues, and stage directions are included. The scribe occasionally left a blank where he could not read the original—and we know that 'Greene's hand was none of the best'.² Apparently therefore it had been prepared from the author's draft; the prompt-book would surely have been legible.

Plots, or 'plats' as they were sometimes called, are skeleton

Deadly Sins; five others are in the British Museum MS. Add. 10449; that of *Tamar Cam* is only known from having been printed in the Variorum Shakespeare of 1803.

¹ *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, ed. J. Q. Adams, 1917, p. 21.

² Henry Chettle, *Kind-heart's Dream*, 1592, 'Epistle to the Gentlemen Readers'.

outlines of plays, constructed mainly of the entrances and exits of the characters with occasional notes of the action, written on large sheets of cardboard to be hung up off-stage for the guidance of the prompter and the actors. All show the scenes marked off from one another by rules, and a few have some indication of acts. They were of course prepared from the prompt-books, and in the more elaborate directions, such as those for dumb shows, some trace of the prompter's phraseology, and even of the author's, survives. The properties required are recorded in their place. We get an insight into the realistic horrors of the Elizabethan stage where three characters are slaughtered and a marginal note calls for 'vials of blood and a sheep's-gather'. A 'gather' or 'pluck' is a technical term for the heart, lights, and liver, one of which was evidently to be torn out of each of the victims in this bloody spectacle.

The interest of these subsidiary documents for our present purpose is that from the actors' parts, with the guidance of the plot, a prompt-book of sorts could undoubtedly be constructed in case of need. We know that something very like this has in fact been done: it has been suggested that it was done in the case of some of Shakespeare's plays, but this is a question that will require consideration later on.

It may be well to sum up as briefly as possible the bearing that the foregoing discussion has upon the probable nature of Shakespeare's text. A company would of course possess the prompt-book of any play in its repertory. This might or might not be in the hand of the author; but if not, it had been prepared from the autograph by a scribe trained to the task, and there would be a possibility at least that the autograph had been preserved. Such a foul copy, though it might be roughly written and show some loose ends, would possess the highest authority short of an edition seen through the press by the author himself. The prompt-book, if prepared by the author, might contain his final revision. But the prompt-book, whether autograph or not, might also have undergone some modification to suit it to the needs of the theatre, the exigencies of the cast, or the prejudices of the censor. The words and even the intention of the author might have been to some extent altered. At the same time,

we have been able to follow in some detail the steps by which the 'book' took shape, and we have found no reason to suppose that the text underwent any serious depravation, apart perhaps from a certain amount of inevitable cutting. Incidentally we have seen that theories of extensive revision, whether by the author or another, on the occasion of a revival should be entertained with caution.

There is no doubt therefore that the manuscripts of Shakespeare's plays in the company's possession would have afforded copy for editions of respectable or even excellent authority had they been placed at the disposal of a printer. How far we can assume that they were so placed is of course another question, to be answered in the last resort from the internal evidence of the texts themselves. To imagine however that in publishing the collection of 1623 Heminge and Condell refused access to the company's store of manuscripts would be gratuitously perverse. The position with respect to the 'good' quartos is less certain, but there are several sound reasons for supposing their origin to be generally similar. We have to take account of the following facts: that in two, if not three, instances an authoritative edition appears to have been put forth deliberately to replace a piracy; that in most cases the folio editors accepted the quarto texts as at least the basis of their own; and that, as I shall argue later,¹ it is highly probable that the manuscripts submitted at Stationers' Hall as authority for the registration of the quarto 'copies' were usually none other than the 'allowed' prompt-books from the theatre. The most decisive evidence however is that on critical examination the texts of nearly all the 'good' quartos prove to be of the same general character as those of pieces first printed in the folio. These considerations afford, I believe, ample ground for Pollard's contention that the manuscripts underlying the printed editions of Shakespeare's plays (except of course the 'bad' quartos) were as a rule of playhouse origin, that they contained in general sound texts, and that some of them were probably in the author's own handwriting. These claims it will be my task to discuss in detail in the next four lectures.

¹ See p. 107.

III. THE 'BAD' QUARTOS

WE have seen how Malone's misinterpretation of the words of Heminge and Condell misled students with respect to the nature of the quartos in general, till Professor Pollard, by distinguishing between the 'good' and the 'bad', showed the true meaning of the passage, and in doing so vindicated at once the essential integrity of Shakespeare's text and the honesty of his first editors.

In the same way Malone's misinterpretation of a famous passage in a letter of the dying Greene to his fellow dramatists has misled students respecting the nature of the 'bad' quartos and also the manner in which Shakespeare served his apprenticeship as a playwright. It is an ironical reflection that Malone, the greatest of Shakespeare's editors, should have done most to lead his successors astray over the foundations of the author's text.

Robert Greene died on 3 Sept. 1592, and within three weeks there was entered in the Stationers' Register, 'upon the peril of Henry Chettle', a pamphlet called *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit bought with a Million of Repentance*, which was printed the same year as 'Written before his death and published at his dying request'. At the end is a letter addressed to three of his friends, who may be plausibly identified as Marlowe, Nashe or Lodge, and Peele, warning them against the uncertainties of their profession: 'To those gentlemen, his quondam acquaintance, that spend their wits in making plays, R. G. wisheth a better exercize, and wisdom to prevent his extremities.' In the course of it he wrote:

Base-minded men, all three of you, if by my misery you be not warned, for unto none of you (like me) sought those burs to cleave, those puppets (I mean) that spake from our mouths, those antics garnished in our colours. Is it not strange that I, to whom they all have been beholding—is it not like that you, to whom they all have been beholding, shall (were ye in that case as I am now) be both at once of them forsaken? Yes, trust them not; for there is an upstart crow, beautified with our feathers, that, with his *tiger's heart wrapt in a player's hide*, supposes he is as well able to bombast out

a blank verse as the best of you, and being an absolute *Johannes fac totum*, is in his own conceit the only Shake-scene in a country. O that I might entreat your rare wits to be employed in more profitable courses, and let those apes imitate your past excellence, and nevermore acquaint them with your admired inventions. . . . whilst you may, seek better masters, for it is a pity men of such rare wits should be subject to the pleasure of such rude grooms.

Here the allusion to Shakespeare is unmistakable, and the 'tiger's heart wrapt in a player's hide' is adapted from a line in the Third Part of *Henry VI* (1. iv. 137):

O tiger's heart wrapt in a woman's hide!

which also appears in the corresponding place in *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York*.

The passage was first cited by Tyrwhitt as evidence that *Henry VI* was by Shakespeare, but Malone took a different view. To him the phrase, 'an upstart crow, beautified with our feathers', suggested that Shakespeare had appropriated the works of Greene and his friends, and the line adapted was one that Shakespeare had filched from the older dramatists. His conclusion was that Greene and Peele were the authors of the two quarto plays, *The First Part of the Contention* and *The True Tragedy*, which he supposed Shakespeare to have partly rewritten as the Second and Third Parts of *Henry VI*: thus¹

Greene could not conceal the mortification that he felt at his own fame and that of his associate, both of them old and admired playwrights, being eclipsed by a new *upstart* writer, (for so he calls our great poet,) who had then first, perhaps, attracted the notice of the publick by exhibiting two plays, formed upon old dramas written by them, considerably enlarged and improved . . . and wishing to depreciate our author, he very naturally quotes a line from one of the pieces which Shakespeare had thus *re-written*; a proceeding which the authors of the original plays considered as an invasion both of their literary property and character. This line, with many others, Shakespeare adopted without any alteration.

When we examine this interpretation closely we may well wonder how it came to be put forward, and still more how it

¹ Malone, 'A Dissertation on the three parts of King Henry VI', Variorum 1821, xviii. 571.

came to be an article of faith among Shakespearian scholars. The whole gist of Greene's complaint was that the actors who had made their reputations through performing his plays had forsaken him in his extremity. He had expressed his opinion of the actor's function two years before:¹

Why, Roscius, art thou proud with Aesop's crow, being prancked with the glory of others' feathers? Of thyself thou canst say nothing, and if the cobbler hath taught thee to say 'Ave Caesar', disdain not thy tutor because thou pratest in a king's chamber. What sentence thou utterest on the stage, flows from the censure of our wits; and what sentence or conceit of the invention the people applaud for excellent, that comes from the secrets of our knowledge.

The actor creates nothing, he can by himself say nothing, he is but the mouthpiece of the author, 'prancked with the glory of others' feathers', with the passion and poetry of better men than himself. It is clear therefore that the 'upstart crow, beautified with our feathers' in the *Groatsworth of Wit* is the same as 'Aesop's crow' in *Never too Late*, merely the actor speaking the poet's lines. There is no hint of plagiarism here. The writer then travesties a line of *Henry VI*, not as an instance of pilfering, but as the sort of bombast with which the player turned author seeks to emulate his betters. The wrong that Green felt was not that his work had been stolen and improved by another, but that one of the despised players, who should have been incapable of original utterance, was rivalling the university wits in their own field; and no doubt it was all the more bitter because the upstart was both deliberately aping their style and beating them at it. The unhappy Greene felt the bread of life being snatched from his mouth by one whom he had thought dependent on him; and his fierce parody is evidence, not that he and Peele had written *The True Tragedy*, but that it and *Henry VI* alike were the work of Shakespeare.

From this original misconception of Malone's sprang a whole jungle of critical and biographical error. Greene had accused Shakespeare of plagiarism and had pointed to *Henry VI* as being a botched-up version of his own *Contention* plays:

¹ Greene's *Never too Late*, part 2 (*Francisco's Fortunes*), 1590; ed. Grosart, viii. 132.

therefore it was evident that Shakespeare had spent his dramatic apprenticeship in vamping the works of his predecessors. Other plays that existed in duplicate versions could be brought in as further instances of revision: in those known only in one, passages could be found recalling the style of this, that, or the other recognized author. Soon the jungle swallowed up the sapling from which it had sprung—and no one seems to have asked how it came about that a young actor of no literary experience (it was assumed) was set to rewrite the works of the leading dramatists of the day.

Later Malone may somewhat have modified his opinion respecting Greene's words, but by that time the harm was done and the superstructure reared on so precarious a foundation had become part of his critical beliefs. He tells us himself that it was Greene's words that 'first suggested' his theory of the authorship of *Henry VI* and were the 'chief hinge' of his argument. The true interpretation, which had been plain to Tyrwhitt, was again pointed out by Dr. J. S. Smart in a fragmentary note, which was not published till after his death,¹ but inspired his friend and successor at Glasgow, Professor Peter Alexander, to a fresh attack on the whole problem.²

2, 3 HENRY VI

When Alexander, reviving the opinion held long before by Dr. Johnson, declared that *The Contention* and *The True Tragedy* were nothing but reported versions of 2 and 3 *Henry VI*, he was attacking the key position of Malone's theory. Whatever views might be entertained of other 'bad' quartos, orthodox opinion for over a century had held that the two pieces printed in 1594 and 1595 were source plays standing in much the same relation to Shakespeare's as do *The Troublesome Reign of King John* and *The Chronicle History of King Leir*. Alexander's first attack was delivered in *The Times Literary Supplement* in 1924 (9 Oct. and 13 Nov.) but after that the details were worked out independently by him and by an American scholar, Miss Madeleine

¹ In *Shakespeare: Truth and Tradition*, 1928.

² See *Shakespeare's 'Henry VI' and 'Richard III'*, 1929.

Doran,¹ and their results appeared almost simultaneously some ten years ago. The demonstration seems to me complete, and since it has convinced such cautious critics as Chambers² and McKerrow, who previously accepted Malone's view, it may be expected to establish a new orthodoxy. The crucial speech is the Duke of York's claim to the throne in 2 *Henry VI*, II. ii, the quarto version of which is unintelligible and self-contradictory; but this is supported by many other passages in the two plays. It becomes manifest on comparison that neither, on the one hand, can the quarto text represent the free composition of any reasonable author; nor on the other, can the folio text be accounted for on any reasonable theory of revision. It should suffice to quote Chambers's remark that the supposed reviser, in the course of a meticulous stylistic rehandling, itself a process for which the Elizabethan theatre affords little evidence, 'took pains to use every shred of the old text which could be made to suit his purpose, either in its original or in an altered position'. This seems to me an effective *reductio ad absurdum* of the older view. But the demonstration that the quartos contain corrupt versions of plays substantially identical with those found in the folio does not of course preclude the possibility of revision between the dates at which the several texts were printed. In this connexion an observation of Miss Doran's is suggestive. She points out that some parts of the folio text actually do bear bibliographical marks of alteration (such as mislining due to marginal addition, obvious verse embedded in prose, and some discrepancy between directions and text—all possibly part of the original writing) but that in these passages the quartos agree with the folio; whereas where the quarto and folio texts differ most widely the latter shows no internal evidence of alteration. Of course the second part of this argument is not conclusive; at the same time I am not, for my part, impressed by the evidence ad-

¹ In the 'University of Iowa Humanistic Studies' (IV. 4), Aug. 1928.

² Chambers did not wait for Alexander's final treatment before revising his own views: see the report of his paper on 'The relation of the Contention of York and Lancaster to the Second and Third Parts of King Henry VI', read before the Oxford Bibliographical Society on 6 Dec. 1926, in the Society's *Proceedings and Papers*, II. 1.

duced in favour of revision—either Tucker Brooke's appeal to variations of style,¹ or McKerrow's ingenious and extraordinarily intricate argument concerning the use of different editions of Holinshed's chronicle.²

I cannot of course enter upon a detailed discussion of the text, but there is one matter of wider concern that may claim a few words in passing. As part of the machinery of the report Alexander postulated the use of fragments of a transcript of the genuine text to account for certain passages in which the two versions are in particularly close agreement. There are almost insuperable technical objections to this assumption, into which I need not enter. To account for the facts McKerrow has put forward an alternative theory that seems to me very probably correct.³ He argues that the identical passages, parallels to which can be found in other plays preserved in duplicate versions, are due to stretches of text having become more or less completely illegible in the manuscript from which the folio was printed, and having been in consequence supplied from the quarto. In other words, the passages in question are not bits of 'good' text embodied in the report (as Alexander assumed) but bits of 'bad' text incorporated in the authoritative version. It may at first seem strange that there should be any doubt whether the passages are 'good' or 'bad' in themselves; but in fact it is not always easy to distinguish between an original and a successful report. A typical case is the substantial fragment comprising 2 *Henry VI*, iv. v and vi. 1-7. In this the text, which hardly differs in the two versions, seems indistinguishable in character from that of the neighbouring scenes in the quarto, yet these we know from comparison with the folio to be seriously corrupt. Moreover, the text of the passage itself is here open to suspicion on internal grounds, for it is sometimes doubtful whether we are dealing with prose or broken-down verse. The quarto prints it as verse, and so does the folio with a few half-hearted attempts at emendation. I am

¹ In the 'Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences', 1912, xvii. 141; see also a review of Alexander's work in *The Journal of English and German Philology*, 1930, xxix. 442, in which his main thesis is accepted.

² *R.E.S.*, 1933, ix. 157. I suspect this of being a mare's-nest.

³ *R.E.S.*, 1937, xiii. 64.

not certain that all the passages instanced by McKerrow are of similar origin, but there is no doubt that his theory deserves careful consideration.

The manuscripts used for the folio text of *Henry VI*, parts 2 and 3, were old copies that had come from one of the early companies, either Strange's or Pembroke's—the evidence favours the latter, slightly. The directions are basically the author's: no one in the theatre would bring in Cade 'with infinite numbers', or 'multitudes with halts about their necks'. But a few specifying music in the imperative may have been added by the book-keeper. There are several actors' names appearing as those of characters. They are attached to subordinate parts that it is unlikely an author would write with a particular actor in mind. Most probably they were substituted for generic designations—Keepers and such—by the prompter. Foul papers are not likely to have survived from so early a date and from another company. Perhaps it is best to suppose an author's fair copy which the book-keeper had annotated to serve as a prompt-book without troubling to make vague directions specific. If so, it may possibly have been Shakespeare's autograph, have lain untouched for a quarter of a century before it was printed, and have become rather illegible in parts. The frequent similarity between the directions of the two versions in part 2 (but not in part 3) must be due to the use made of the quarto in preparing the folio text.¹

Professor Alexander, as I have said, attacked tradition at its strongest point, for since Malone wrote few had doubted that the *Contention* plays were either source plays or first drafts of *Henry VI*. Concerning other 'bad' quartos opinion was more divided. Some critics were for the source-draft theory, some were for reporting; others again combined the two views in varying proportions. It was clear that there were features common to all these versions, if only the comparative shortness of the texts. But these features are in fact not peculiar to the 'bad' Shakespearian quartos; they can occa-

¹ The directions of the two versions afford a very interesting study. I have collected material for a comparison in the appendix (p. 159).

sionally be recognized in the texts of plays by other Elizabethan authors.¹ It became evident that some investigation outside Shakespeare might prove enlightening, and it occurred to me that two plays afforded exceptional opportunities: namely Peele's *Battle of Alcazar*, of which we possess the theatrical plot, and Greene's *Orlando Furioso*, of which the actor's part of the title-role survives. From a study of these² two facts emerged: one that there really existed a class of shortened texts (originating, it is commonly supposed, with reduced companies forced to tour the provinces) the other that not all shortened texts were of the same character. On analysis *Alcazar* proved to be a version much abbreviated by cuts, its action simplified for production with a smaller cast, but affording no indication of serious textual corruption; whereas *Orlando*, equally abridged, was characterized by the omission of much of the high-flown poetry of the original, by the development and insertion of scenes of clownage, and by persistent corruption and vulgarization of the text. The one was an orderly abridgement made directly from the authorized prompt-book; the other could only have taken shape in the course of acting before a low-class audience by a company whose performance was unregulated by any formal prompt-book at all.³ Now, it is rather to the second type that the Shakespearian 'bad' quartos belong. Though they nowhere, I think, show such extensive vulgarization as is to be found in *Orlando*, the introduction of actors' gag⁴ and the less seemly sort of jests is not unknown, and episodes of clownage are introduced into the Jack Cade scenes of *The First Part of the Contention*. Again we often find that the best poetry has been omitted, and while the text varies enormously from scene to scene, we find it at times reduced to a fragmentary and chaotic condition unparalleled even in *Orlando*.

It is natural that critics should have sought a common

¹ An attempt to compile 'A Census of Bad Quartos' in the Elizabethan and Jacobean drama has lately been made by Leo Kirschbaum in *R.E.S.*, 1938, xiv. 20. He enumerates twenty-one texts (including Shakespeare's) but the list is almost certainly incomplete.

² *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements*, 1923.

³ Progressive alteration and impromptu vulgarization of the authorized script are common in touring companies today.

⁴ See Chambers in *T.L.S.*, 8 Mar. 1928.

occasion to which all these texts could be referred. This was found by Pollard and Dover Wilson in the dislocation of the theatrical profession by the plague of 1592-3, which drove the London companies into the country and brought some of them to ruin.¹ Since *The Contention* and *The True Tragedy* and *The Taming of a Shrew*, as well as *Alcazar* and *Orlando* and several similar texts, were printed immediately after the plague years, there is probably a good deal of truth in the view. At the same time the desire to find a formula that will cover all cases has led to a rather uncritical insistence on this factor, and to postulating a series of Shakespearian compositions in the early nineties for which there is not sufficient evidence.

It is now generally admitted that reporting at least played a part in the production of the 'bad' quartos. How was this reporting done? Shorthand has from the first been suspected,² and German critics in particular have written much and learnedly on the subject. Three systems come under review: Timothy Bright's 'Charactery' published in 1588, Peter Bales's 'Brachygraphy' in 1590, and John Willis's 'Stenography' in 1602; but the second of these was no more than a modification of the first without material improvement. There is contemporary evidence for the use of shorthand in the reporting of plays, though it is less than has sometimes been represented. In 1612 Sir George Buc, Master of the Revels, stressed the importance of Brachygraphy, since 'by the means and help thereof, they which know it can readily take a sermon, oration, play, or any long speech, as they are spoken, dictated, acted, and uttered, in the instant'.³ But Buc's information was clearly out of date, for Bales's work had been superseded ten years before; he seems to be speaking at second hand and to be reporting the claims rather than the actual performance of the system. About

¹ See the articles mentioned on p. 43, note 1.

² Theobald wrote that 'many pieces were taken down in short-hand, and imperfectly copied by ear from a representation' (preface to his edition of Shakespeare, (1733) 1740; Variorum 1821, i. 33). He was, of course, speaking of the quartos in general.

³ *The Third University of England*, chap. 39 (1612), in Stow's *Annals*, 1615, sig. 40r.

1630 Thomas Heywood wrote a prologue to his play of *Queen Elizabeth*,¹ in which he asserted that the printed text had been pirated:

some by Stenography drew

The plot, put it in print, scarce one word true . . .

The quarto of 1605² undoubtedly contains a reported text, which I see no reason to doubt might have been produced by Willis's system. Indeed, we are at liberty to suppose that this could have done considerably better; for the text of Heywood's play is an exceedingly poor one, and seems on the internal evidence to be more likely a memorial reconstruction by two or three actors who had taken part in the performance.³ Heywood was writing a quarter of a century after the event, and he may not even at the time have been very accurately informed. What his words, coupled with a vaguer reference in 1608⁴ to plays 'copied only by the ear', which of itself need not imply shorthand—what his words do allow us to infer is that Stenography was known, or at least supposed, to have been used for the pirating of plays within a few years of its introduction.

But since Stenography was presumably not in use before 1602 it cannot have played a part in the earlier piracies, and it is unlikely that it did so in *The Merry Wives* or even in *Hamlet*. If we dismiss Peter Bales as unimportant, the only earlier system was Bright's Charactery, and it is round the alleged use of this that controversy has centred. It is a very clumsy and primitive system, depending largely on the use of synonyms and with little capacity for reproducing grammatical structure. Many have doubted the possibility of taking down a play by it with any approach to verbal accuracy. In its favour is the fact, so it is contended, that certain printed sermons are stated to have been reported by this system, and that an authorized version afterwards published shows the pirated texts to be reasonably accurate. The

¹ *Pleasant Dialogues and Dramas*, 1637, p. 248.

² *If you Know not Me you Know Nobody*, part 1; see the edition by M. Doran, Malone Society, introduction.

³ See G. N. Giordano-Orsini, 'Thomas Heywood's Play on "The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth"', *The Library*, 1933, xiv. 313.

⁴ *The Rape of Lucrece*, address 'To the Reader'.

answer to this is, in the first place, that the system would undoubtedly serve to take elaborate notes, from which the substance of a sermon could then be reconstructed; and in the second, that since the sermons were no doubt delivered extempore, there can have been no pre-existing text by which to check the report—what the author appears to have done was to accept the piratical text and touch it up to suit his fancy.¹ It has further been argued that the use of Charactery can be demonstrated in the 'bad' quartos from the nature of the errors they contain. But the characteristic error of Bright's system is the substitution of synonyms, and this is equally the characteristic error of actors imperfect in their parts, or indeed of any one who tries to reproduce words from memory. Therefore, since Bright's advocates admit that many of the errors found in the quartos must anyhow be attributed to the imperfect memorization of actors, there seems no need to introduce a second agency. *Essentia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem.*

It is impossible to prove that the use of Charactery played no part in the production of the 'bad' quartos. But perhaps the most striking feature of most of these is the extraordinary inequality of the text. In some parts we find almost verbal accuracy, elsewhere mere paraphrase eked out with occasional words and expressions from the original. Now, the former I do not for a moment believe to be within the compass of Bright's system: for the latter it would unquestionably serve—but so would unaided memory. Besides there are two particular objections to shorthand. One is that its use would suggest that the report was made with a view to publication; whereas criticism tends rather to connect these versions with the stage and to regard publication as no more than incidental.² The other is the difficulty of a stenographer escaping notice in the ordinary theatre.

But if not shorthand, then what? If we considered only the average quality of the 'bad' quartos, I believe that mere

¹ This point, as indeed the whole question of shorthand, is well discussed by G. I. Duthie, *The 'Bad' Quarto of 'Hamlet'*, 1941, p. 20. The case against Bright has been best put by W. Matthews in articles in *The Modern Language Review*, 1932, xxvii. 243, and *The Library*, 1935, xv. 481.

² As suggested for instance by Crompton Rhodes, *Shakespeare's First Folio*, p. 73.

memorization on the part of a pirate in the audience would suffice. But I doubt whether this would account either for the almost verbal accuracy of the best passages, or for the vast difference between the best and the worst. Chambers has pointed out that the book-keeper or prompter would be in a position to acquire a good general knowledge of a play, and has suggested that he may now and again have turned pirate. The theory is not unattractive, but I feel that the great unevenness of the texts again raises a difficulty. Thirty years ago I put forward the view that in *The Merry Wives* the pirate was the actor who took the part of mine Host of the Garter.¹ His own speeches are generally well reported, when he is on or near the stage the level of the text almost invariably rises, and when he finally goes out of the play it falls to pieces altogether. I do not know whether the idea was a new one—probably not: at any rate I make no claim to originality—but it has found a good deal of favour with critics, who have since applied it to several other plays with varying degrees of success. In *Henry VI* Alexander finds the reporters in two actors, one of whom played Warwick, the other Suffolk and, after his death, Clifford. This seems to me plausible, in spite of some objection from Chambers, due I think to a misunderstanding.

Researches by R. Crompton Rhodes into the text of Sheridan have unexpectedly confirmed this origin of the 'bad' quartos by showing that something very similar happened more than a century and a half later.² He quotes John Bernard's own account of how, after the success of *The School for Scandal* in 1777, he reconstructed a text of the play from parts and from recollection for the theatre at Exeter: it is also known that a fake version of *The Duenna* compiled by Tate Wilkinson was printed some fifteen years before the genuine text.

I believe that the theory that regards 'bad' quartos as essentially reports of the full Shakespearian texts is the true

¹ *Shakespeare's Merry Wives of Windsor, 1602*, ed. in the 'Tudor and Stuart Library', Oxford, 1910, p. xl.

² See *The Times Literary Supplement*, 17 and 24 Sept. 1925; *The Library*, 1928, ix. 233; and his edition of Sheridan, 1928, i. 255, ii. 162.

one. Whether they are reports of the texts exactly as we have them is of course a more difficult question. It is possible that after the reports were made the plays may have undergone revision.¹ This view is still held by many, and it is not possible to disprove it. At the same time, except in a few instances of minor importance, there seems to me little specific evidence of alteration or addition, while for any general practice of literary textual revision there is none at all. We shall be wise not to postulate revision except on evidence of a cogent character.

It is clear that I cannot in a single lecture discuss the several texts in detail. What I propose to do is first to examine that of *Romeo and Juliet* as a typical example, and then to say something respecting the peculiar features of the others.

ROMEO AND JULIET

The three extant texts of *Romeo and Juliet*, the quartos of 1597 and 1599 and the folio of 1623, reduce themselves to two, for the folio proves to be an almost literal reprint of the 'good' second quarto, or rather of the reprint of that quarto issued in 1609, though for some reason it omitted the prologue.

There is no doubt I think that Q₂ reproduces Shakespeare's foul papers, which must have undergone a certain amount of tidying up and minor revision when the prompt-book was prepared. This is clear from some confusion in the Queen Mab speech and a duplication of the Friar's opening words, besides other indications.² There is no reason why

¹ The position is slightly complicated by the fact that the reports may be of stage versions that had already been to some extent altered from the authoritative texts that we possess. This however is relatively unimportant since it would leave the reports purely derivative. The main question is that raised above, whether the authoritative texts themselves were in any way altered after the preparation of the reports or of the versions upon which these were based.

² There are more or less obvious duplications at II. ii. 10-11 ('It is my lady, oh it is my love, oh that she knew she were'), III. iii. 40-3, IV. i. 111, V. iii. 102-3 ('I will believe, / Shall I believe that unsubstantial Death is amorous'), and V. iii. 108-9. Of course editors have removed most of these. Observe that the Boy's line, 'O Lord, they fight! I will go call the watch', at V. iii. 71 is printed as a stage direction, evidently because it had been added in the margin without a speaker's name, just as the Nurse's cries within of 'Madam' are without prefix in the margin at II. ii. 149,

Shakespeare should not at one point have set down Will Kemp's name in place of Peter's: he was obviously writing the part for him.

But Q₂ was not printed throughout from manuscript: a section near the beginning (the exact extent of which is disputed) appears to have been set up from a corrected copy of the 'bad' first quarto, and there are some later passages in which Q₁ was at least consulted. Presumably the manuscript was in parts defective or illegible. The most obvious evidence of the dependence of Q₂ on Q₁ is the common use of italic type for the earlier speeches of the Nurse. That Q₂ copied this peculiarity from Q₁ there can be no doubt: the reason for it in Q₁ is problematical. The most obvious explanation is that an actor's part, written in Italian script, had been cut up and pasted into the copy. But though the speeches are on the whole very accurate, there are a few errors which suggest that an actor may rather have written out his part from memory.

There is no question but that Q₁ is in the main a report. It varies greatly in quality, as nearly all the 'bad' quartos do. Roughly, the first two acts are well reported, the third loosely; the last two are mere paraphrase embodying now more now fewer genuine words. The difference between the best and the worst is so great that at first sight it seems difficult to suppose them due to the same agency. Parts of Acts I and II are astonishingly accurate. There are a couple of pages almost without variant. It is true that here Q₁ served as copy for Q₂, and the corrector certainly overlooked one error, but apart from this the report seems nowhere open to

151. A similar explanation may be offered of the erroneous direction at III. v. 37, 'Enter Madam and Nurse'. Lady Capulet is called 'Wife' and 'Mother' and 'Lady of the house', but not 'Madam', and she certainly does not enter here. Presumably there was a marginal direction 'Enter Nurse. Madam', i.e. enter the Nurse calling 'Madam' (which was then duplicated in the text as 'Nur. Madam'). At IV. v. 128-30 Shakespeare in quoting a popular song from *The Paradise of Dainty Devices* did not trouble to write more than the first and last lines. All this points to foul papers. The confusion by which at v. iii. 22 the name Peter occurs in a direction for Romeo's boy Balthazar may be due to a note by the book-keeper indicating that the part could be doubled with that of the Clown. The stage directions of Q₂ bear out the suggestion of foul papers, and a comparison with those of Q₁ is interesting. A list of the more significant examples in each is given in the appendix (p. 162).

tions,¹ which have been thought to indicate that the text had been put together from actors' parts. I must reserve this for discussion with similar cases later on.²

Q is on the whole a poor report and goes altogether to pieces in the last act, which contains much reconstruction in un-Shakespearian verse with a fragment of a London ballad embedded in it. Five scenes are omitted, two are transposed. The Host's part is generally much the best reported, and the text as a rule improves when he is on or near the stage: he does not appear in Act V. I formerly suggested that the report was made by the actor of this part. It may be so, but there are difficulties. Even apart from two scenes dealing with the horse-stealing (in which the fact that the Host did not know his own part might be due to its having been altered) the superiority of the scenes in which he appears is not quite uniform (for instance the beginning of II. ii, when he is off, is better than the end of II. i, when he is on): moreover, there are errors in his speeches that perhaps suggest mishearing rather than the blunders of a compositor (iv. v. 93, 'I am cozened Hugh, and coy Bardolf' for 'hue and cry'!). Perhaps it would be safer to assume an independent reporter relying generally on mine Host's assistance.

The text of Q is of course much abridged. This may mean that it is a report of a shortened performance: but in view of the frequent occurrence, in what remains, of displaced fragments from what is omitted, it seems on the whole more likely that the performance was substantially a full one and that the abbreviation is the reporter's, due either to his inability to produce anything more adequate or to a deliberate intention of shortening the play. If the latter, the piracy was presumably made for acting. There is no proof one way or the other; but the heavy cutting of the opening, of which however a fragment is used later, suggests it, and so does the excision of two boys' parts; it is also noticeable that directions, though descriptive, seem to have the regulation of the action in view.

¹ See pp. 134-8 and appendix (p. 168).

² In fact F appears to have been probably printed from a transcript by Ralph Crane, most likely of foul papers: see pp. 136-7.

There are some half-dozen lines or phrases peculiar to Q that editors have thought to be Shakespearian and have tried to work into the authorized text. Some may have been accidentally omitted from F; others are more difficult to accommodate, and it has of course been suggested that F represents a revised text. That some alteration was made subsequent to the reported performance is evident from the substitution of Broom for Brook as Ford's alias; but this of course proves nothing further. I used to think that the horse-stealing episode once held a more important position in the plot—the 'garmombles' joke survives only in Q (iv. v. 79)—and that the break-down in the reporting at this point was due to the Host having had to learn a new part and having learned it badly. I have above suggested a different explanation. I no longer feel convinced that in the last act Q goes back to an original different from F, though the latter assumes a courtly, the former a popular, audience: this would be a necessary alteration if the piracy was made for acting. F itself is not a very satisfactory text. Falstaff says 'Heavens defend me from that Welsh fairy'; but Sir Hugh as Jackanapes drops his Welsh speech. This of course is just carelessness, like much else in this hastily written piece.

THE TAMING OF THE SHREW

There remain two plays to be considered, *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Pericles*. The former at least stands on a different footing from those we have hitherto examined, for the quarto contains what is virtually a distinct piece. The folio, the only authority for the play we know as Shakespeare's, was evidently printed from an early manuscript, which, like 2 and 3 *Henry VI*, may have come from Pembroke's men. It has author's directions,¹ and some contradictions in these as well as confusions in the plot and among the speakers may be explained by alterations in the course of composition as easily as by later revision. 'Enter four or five Serving-men' at iv. i. 109. Their names can hardly be those of actors, but it is conceivable that two or three are preserved in speech-

¹ See appendix (p. 168).

prefixes at other points.¹ A stage transcript in which the roughness of the original draft had been imperfectly removed seems more likely as copy than foul papers, especially if (as even Chambers concedes) there are more hands than one in the play. There is an imperfect and rather irregular division into acts only.²

The quarto of 1594 (which happens to give the title as *a Shrew* instead of *the Shrew*) although it can only by licence be classed as a 'bad' quarto, nevertheless contains a version which, it seems to me, is clearly derivative. In the underplot F is certainly nearer to the source in Ariosto's *Suppositi* (or Gascoigne's *Supposes*) and there are a number of subsidiary points where Q implies an original resembling F. But except for a few bungled reminiscences Q does not appear to be a reported text; it is freely written in stiff and flat blank verse interlarded with an astonishing assortment of thefts from Marlowe. It would seem that all the writer had to go upon was a fairly full synopsis of F together with a few recollections or perhaps reported fragments of the dialogue, such as the jest about the tailor (iv. iii. 125), of which he missed the point.

This view, which was revived rather than originated by J. C. Smart, has been developed by Professor Alexander.³ Chambers, who is 'quite unable to believe' it, I cannot imagine why, thinks that Shakespeare rewrote the source play with fresh reference to Ariosto or Gascoigne. This seems to me much more incredible. The formula for such a work as

¹ The servants at iv. i. 109 are those named with others in the text at ll. 91-2, and the prefixes are therefore not due to the book-keeper. Nor can the parts have been cast in his mind by the author. On the other hand, in the Induction a speech by one of the Players has the prefix *Sincklo*. The Lord recognizes him as having played the part of 'Soto', which 'Was aptly fitted'. There would be no point in this unless it was a real part that Sincklo was known to have played, and unless he had some peculiarity by which the Lord and the audience would naturally recognize him. We have reason to believe that Sincklo's appearance was in fact striking (see p. 116, note 3). This name, we may therefore suppose, was purposely introduced by the author and not casually by the book-keeper.

² The second is not marked: the third is headed 'Actus Tertia', which suggests possible confusion. Modern editors alter the division.

³ *The Times Literary Supplement*, 16 Sept. 1926; *Shakespeare's 'Henry VI' and 'Richard III'*, 1929, p. 69. McKerrow, I may mention, was convinced of the derivative character of Q, though he objected to its being called a 'bad' quarto.

Q was given long ago by Tate Wilkinson when he described how he vamped up a version of Sheridan's *Duenna*:¹

I locked myself up in my room, set down first the jokes I remembered, then I laid a book of the songs before me, and with magazines kept the regulation of the scenes, and by the help of a numerous collection of obsolete Spanish plays I produced an excellent opera . . .

It should be observed that F has pretty certainly not come down to us unaltered. The Christopher Sly framework has disappeared from the latter part of the play. It is complete if only a shadow of its real self in Q, and must surely have been so in the original.²

PERICLES

The official 'book' of *Pericles* was entered in 1608 but never printed. The quarto that appeared the following year is usually classed as 'bad', and bad in some measure it may be allowed to be, though had it not been for its irregular publication I doubt whether Pollard would have thought of including it in his list. In the absence of any authorized text with which to compare the quarto, and the presence of scenes that are presumably not by Shakespeare, it is difficult to form any very accurate idea of the nature of the text, but it certainly nowhere approaches the worst of the other 'bad' quartos, and on the whole resembles *Henry V* for example less than it does *King Lear*. It may be no coincidence that it appeared the year after that play. The directions, apart from dumb shows, are only slightly descriptive; a few are vague regarding number, as might happen with a reporter as well as an author.³ The play was printed in the folio of 1664 from the sixth quarto without alteration.

¹ For references see p. 60, note 2.

² The quarto, which was regularly entered in the Stationers' Register on 2 May 1594, states that the play 'was sundry times acted by . . . the Earl of Pembroke his servants'. If, therefore, Pembroke's men really owned the manuscript printed in F (as suggested above) either they vamped up the Q version after they had parted with the prompt-book, which seems unlikely, or else the publisher was trying to pass it off as the play they were known to have performed. I suspect however that the belief that Pembroke's men owned the F version rests mainly on the statement in the quarto.

³ See appendix (p. 170). The circumstances of publication have already been touched on; see pp. 20-1.

In conclusion we may consider for a moment what value the 'bad' quartos have for an editor. As a rule of course they only come in question when there is definite reason to suppose that the authoritative text is corrupt. On such occasions they do in fact afford occasional assistance, and editors have been perhaps only too ready to avail themselves of it. The most noticeable instance is the preservation of the full framework of *The Taming of the Shrew*, though here the text is so remote that there has been no attempt at amalgamation.¹ I have mentioned the possible preservation in the quarto of *The Merry Wives* of Shakespearian fragments that editors have perhaps injudiciously sought to graft onto the folio text. The play in which most use has been made of a 'bad' quarto is *Romeo and Juliet*, editors from Pope on having resorted freely to the readings of Q1. Trivialities apart, the old Cambridge editors, who are fairly conservative in this respect, accept its reading in preference to that of Q2 in about 120 instances. In view of the remarkable accuracy of parts of the report and of the fact that the authoritative text was apparently printed from foul papers that lacked final revision, this is not altogether surprising. Still I do not think that more than a third of these readings could be defended on critical grounds.² In *Hamlet* too some use has been made of the 'bad' first quarto. The Cambridge editors adopted its reading in preference to that of Q2 and F in eight instances, though in only one do I think they were justified.

But the most important service rendered by the 'bad' quartos is through the confirmation they sometimes afford of the reading of the authoritative text where this might appear open to question. The agreement of a report with a scribally transmitted text (provided there is no direct connexion between them) puts a reading practically beyond question, unless it is of such a nature that we can imagine

¹ No recent attempt, that is. Pope introduced several passages from the quarto, but these were mostly turned out again by Capell.

² I formerly wrote that 'if it is once admitted that the first quarto is right in two score cases, there is no particular reason to jib at six score' (*Aspects of Shakespeare*, p. 146). I think this was a hasty judgement. There is very little evidence that any readings of Q1 go back to alterations made in preparing the prompt-copy, which would be the only excuse for accepting them except where F is certainly corrupt.

an error in the prompt-book establishing itself on the stage. And in this connexion it should be observed that the function of a 'bad' quarto differs somewhat according as we regard the authoritative text as printed from the prompt-book or from foul papers. In the former case the readings of the 'bad' quarto can have no possible authority (unless the printer of the authoritative text has corrupted his copy); in the latter they may sometimes represent a modification of the author's draft made in preparing the prompt-book and thus have at least playhouse sanction.

This of course assumes the modern view of the origin of the 'bad' quartos. But more generally we may ask how the editorial problem is affected by the view we adopt. If the 'bad' quartos were source plays or first drafts they might still be used in cases of obvious corruption, as Holinshed and North have been used to correct Shakespeare's text elsewhere. If, as I have argued, they are reports of performances of the final Shakespearian versions, it is equally possible that in places where the authoritative texts have suffered damage in transmission, they may possibly preserve, or at least suggest, the original reading. It might therefore appear that the origin was not very relevant. Yet that the two cases should be distinguished becomes evident when we consider *Hamlet* with its three distinct texts. For example, if Q₁ is derivative, then agreement of Q₁ and F against Q₂ may be due to an original reading in Shakespeare's manuscript having been altered in preparing the prompt-book; on the other hand, if Q₁ is antecedent, the same possibility arises in case of the opposite agreement of Q₁ and Q₂ against F. It is not perhaps a very important point, but it is one that an editor may bear in mind.

IV. TWO DOUBTFUL QUARTOS

WHEN we compare the texts of the quartos generally classed as 'good' with those of the same plays printed in the folio, two stand out from the rest as presenting, owing to the marked and peculiar nature of their divergence,¹ problems of unusual difficulty—problems moreover that have as yet found no generally accepted solution. They are *Richard III*, printed in 1597, and *King Lear*, the original 'Pied Bull' quarto of which appeared (perhaps early) in 1608. The dates are important, since we shall find that in each case we have to consider the possibility of shorthand reporting and consequently the systems that were available at the time of publication.

The two plays have a number of textual features in common, the most noticeable being persistent variation between quarto and folio in individual words and phrases. The alternative readings are often more or less indifferent, and editors have preferred now one and now the other, though they have often disagreed among themselves in their choice. The idea of literary revision has been generally prominent, but critics have not always been in agreement as to which text was revised.

RICHARD III

In *Richard III* some editors have on the whole favoured the quarto, some the folio, and almost every one has explained the superiority of the text he preferred in a different way. It will be convenient to cite as typical two contrasted views of particular authority. According to the Cambridge editors in 1865 the quarto was printed from a rather imperfect transcript of Shakespeare's original manuscript; subsequently this original was revised by the author, and in this state it was again transcribed, with arbitrary alterations, this transcript being used as copy for the folio. The essence of this theory is a revision by Shakespeare himself, which makes the folio the authoritative text; the two transcripts are little more

¹ Divergence greater than and different from that which we observe in 2 *Henry IV*, *Troilus and Cressida*, and *Othello*.

than an ingenious device to allow an editor to choose, in any particular case, whichever reading he happens to like best. Almost any differences can be so explained. And yet, even assuming one transcriber who carelessly omitted a number of passages and the rather improbable audacity of another who worked 'in the spirit . . . of Colley Cibber', I doubt whether it is really possible to make the theory of first draft and revision appear plausible.

Some twenty years later P. A. Daniel,¹ whose views, even when one disagrees, always deserve consideration, put forward the opposite opinion and argued, on the basis of a limited number of selected variants, that the folio represented the original and the quarto a revised text. This is a contention to which it is more difficult to give a flat denial, for a stage version (as we shall see the quarto is) inevitably undergoes some sort of revision in the course of preparation. But that the quarto represents in any way a literary and stylistic revision of the folio seems to me a theory even more untenable than the last, for I am convinced that wherever choice is possible the folio offers not only the more original but also the more acceptable text.

I have commented before on the absence of any external evidence that could predispose us to admit the likelihood in Shakespeare's plays of such stylistic revision as is here contemplated. I must add my conviction that in the present instance it is impossible to look on the quarto as untrammelled composition, but only as a derivative text; and that it is equally impossible to regard the differences between the quarto and the folio as due to any conceivable form of conscious literary revision.

These considerations together with the general superiority of the folio text are frankly recognized by the only other critic whose authority here claims attention for his views. According to Chambers the folio reproduces the original manuscript with general fidelity, whereas the quarto was printed from a transcript of the same made by the book-keeper for publication. In making his copy he adopted the

¹ Introduction to the Griggs facsimile of the first quarto. This was printed in 1883 but not published till 1885.

cuts and alterations that had been marked in the original for purposes of representation (and which the folio consistently ignored) and also, being himself thoroughly conversant with the text, often wrote down what he was accustomed to hear on the stage rather than what stood in the manuscript before him, 'thus vulgarizing the style, and producing in a minor degree the features of a reported text'. This is an attractive theory that really takes account of the character of the two versions. There is no doubt that a copyist familiar with the text may contaminate that of his exemplar with readings derived from his own memory;¹ it is even possible that he might deliberately prefer readings that had established themselves in performance to those of the author's original, at least where the divergence was intentional. But even so I find it rather difficult to believe that the theory will account satisfactorily for the actual state of the quarto with its persistent minor variation. More difficult still is it to suppose that several instances of actors' improvisation masking failure of memory should have so established themselves on the stage as to have become fixed in the prompter's mind, or that in making his transcript he would deliberately have substituted them for the genuine text.

I might have lacked confidence to differ so emphatically from critics of established authority were it not that my own tentative conclusions have recently been confirmed in a remarkable manner by the researches of Dr. D. L. Patrick. In a monograph on *The Textual History of 'Richard III'*² this American scholar has made the first really exhaustive study of the evidence, and he concludes that the quarto represents in the first place an acting version, and in the second place an actors' perversion, of the genuine text. The suggestion is not new, for it has been entertained by one or two critics since it was first advanced in 1880 by the Shakespearian lexicographer Alexander Schmidt, but this is the first serious attempt to prove it. Professor Patrick demonstrates,

¹ Dover Wilson has I think amply demonstrated the presence of such contamination in the transcript of the prompt-book from which the folio text of *Hamlet* was printed (*The Manuscript of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet'*, i. 50 ff.).

² Stanford University Publications, Language and Literature (VI. i), 1936. I may mention that McKerrow had come some years before to the same conclusion.

all the more convincingly for the studied moderation of his argument, that the quarto version has been shortened mainly by being adapted to the needs of a restricted cast, and that it exhibits clearly, if 'in a minor degree', most of the familiar features of a report—such as repetition and anticipation, transposition and substitution, improvisation and vulgarization, which naturally account for the frequent and more or less indifferent variants that are so marked a characteristic of the texts.

Assuming for the moment that the folio represents the original manuscript with only minor errors and omissions,¹ it seems to me that the nature of the quarto should be apparent on any really careful comparison. It is shorter by nearly 200 lines, the result largely of the elimination of several minor characters. The most obvious instance perhaps is where Catesby, instead of Lovell and Ratcliffe, is commissioned to see to the execution of Hastings, though Buckingham later excuses this as due to the 'haste of *these* our *friends*'. Other eliminations are effected where the folio line,

Sir William Brandon, you shall bear my standard
is ingeniously if unmetrically altered to

Where is Sir William Brandon? He shall bear my standard
and shortly afterwards through the simple omission of the lines,

My Lord of Oxford, you Sir William Brandon,
And you Sir Walter Herbert, stay with me.

Confusion has resulted at the beginning of iv. i through the removal of Clarence's daughter, who in the folio accompanies the Duchess of Gloucester as a mute; for when the six-line omission was made, one half-line, 'my niece Plantagenet', was clumsily left standing, with the result that it appears to be the Queen who is thus addressed. In several instances cutting has resulted in dislocation of the verse; moreover one of the omitted passages was suggested by

¹ The only important omission in F, the famous 'clock' passage (iv. ii. 102-19), has been the subject of much debate. It may have been cut on political grounds: see W. J. Griffin in *R.E.S.*, 1937, xiii. 329, with McKerrow's note on p. 332.

the earlier *True Tragedy of Richard III*¹ and therefore presumably belonged to the original text of the play.²

It would be tedious to give many instances of the derivative character of the quarto text, nor is it necessary. Minor transpositions are frequent, as in

Thy Edward he is dead, that killed my Edward . . .

Thy Clarence he is dead, that stabbed my Edward,

where, though the lines are four apart, Q interchanges 'killed' and 'stabbed'. So are assimilations, as in

Stabbed by the selfsame hand that made these wounds . . .

O cursed be the hand that made these holes:

here, though the lines are three apart, Q has 'holes' in both places. The long list of synonymous variants runs—see: spy, killed: slew, breast: bosom, withal: at all, stormed at: baited at, and so on. Now all these types of error may occur in transcription or printing: it is a question of frequency. *Richard III* was reprinted seven times from 1598 to 1634: in these seven reprints there are ten instances of transposition, in Q1 (as compared with F) there are sixty; in seven reprints six assimilations, in Q1 seventy-five; in seven reprints a dozen or so synonyms, in Q1 two hundred of the closest type (like those just quoted) and a hundred and fifty of a looser sort, besides seventy differences in number and ninety in titles and forms of address.

Transpositions trivial in themselves have repeatedly wrought havoc with the verse:

F: Off with his head! now, by Saint Paul I swear

I will not dine until I see the same.

Lovell and Ratcliffe, look that it be done . . .

Q: Off with his head! now, by Saint Paul,

I will not dine today, I swear,

Until I see the same. Some see it done . . .

¹ II. ii. 124-40; cf. *True Tragedy*, ll. 492-503 (Malone Society reprint). One or two others can be traced to a source in the chronicles.

² Patrick (p. 24) suggests that the error whereby the speech of the Bishop of Ely at III. iv. 6 is assigned to Rivers (who is already dead) may be due to a doubling of parts, the prompter having made a marginal note of the actor available. If so the prompter was nodding, for Rivers speaks the last lines of the previous scene as he is led to execution. More likely the prefix *By* for Bishop (as at l. 48) was misread *Ry*. and wrongly expanded to *Ryu*. by the compositor, who had already set up the prefix four times on the same page.

Lovell and Ratcliffe have of course disappeared from the cast; the rest of the confusion starts with the transposition of 'I swear' and includes the repetition of 'see' for 'look'. Or again:

F: Therefore present to her, as sometime Margaret
 Did to thy father, steeped in Rutland's blood
 A handkerchief, which say to her did drain
 The purple sap from her sweet brother's body,
 And bid her wipe her weeping eyes withal.

We hardly look to *Richard III* for subtlety of phrase or rhythm, but here the harsh inversion is certainly effective, besides being almost essential to the construction of a rather turgid sentence. All is lost in

Q: Therefore present to her, as sometimes Margaret
 Did to thy father, a handkercher steeped in Rutland's blood,
 And bid her dry her weeping eyes therewith

which misses the whole point. The following example is I think significant. Margaret asks Elizabeth, 'A queen in jest' as she calls her, a series of rhetorical questions, 'Where is thy husband now? where be thy brothers?' and so forth, and then proceeds in F:

Decline all this, and see what now thou art.
 For happy wife, a most distressed widow:
 For joyful mother, one that wails the name:
 For one being sued to, one that humbly sues:
 For queen, a very caitiff crowned with care:
 For she that scorned at me, now scorned of me:
 For she being feared of all, now fearing one:
 For she commanding all, obeyed of none.

The order of the lines is determined by that of the antecedent questions (the same in Q as in F) of which the key words are husband, sons or children, sues, queen, bending peers, and thronging troops. Yet only the first pair is correctly given in Q, which afterwards omits one line and disturbs the order of the others. To what cause can such confusion be assigned if not to an actor's lapse in a speech where strict accuracy would be very difficult to attain? Surely a transcriber

would have kept his eye on the copy. Or compare the passages:

F: The Britain navy is dispersed by tempest:
 Richmond in Dorsetshire sent out a boat
 Unto the shore, to ask those on the banks
 If they were his assistants, yea or no . . .

Q: The Britain navy is dispersed: Richmond in Dorshire
 Sent out a boat to ask them on the shore
 If they were his assistants, yea or no . . .

Can we suppose anything but failure of memory responsible for the lame verse which has resulted in the addition of a new name to the list of English counties?

As an instance of *assimilation*, a very common fault of memory, take the two lines, six apart, that run in F:

That Anne, my wife, is very grievous sick . . .
 That Anne, my queen, is sick and like to die.

Q has in each place the conflated line,

That Anne, my wife, is sick and like to die.

For *anticipation* take Brakenbury's question to the First Murderer:

F: What would'st thou, fellow, and how cam'st thou hither?

Q: In God's name what are you, and how came you hither?

The folio must be correct, for it is to its first question that the Murderer replies (in F and Q alike) with the words 'I would speak with Clarence': the quarto has anticipated Clarence's own words 'In God's name what art thou?' that occur in both texts some eighty lines further on. For *recollection* take the lines in which Clarence's son describes Richard's pretended affection:

F: And when my uncle told me so, he wept,
 And pitied me, and kindly kissed my cheek . . .

Q: And when he told me so, he wept,
 And hugged me in his arm, and kindly kissed my cheek . . .

Metrical irregularity condemns the quarto—Shakespeare does not write run-on lines like these in *Richard III*—and fantastic explanations have been suggested. Actually the text has simply been contaminated by recollection of

Clarence's description of his own parting with Richard given a couple of scenes earlier:

It cannot be, for he bewept my fortune,
And hugged me in his arms, and swore with sobs
That he would labour my delivery.

So again when Tyrrel goes to murder the young Princes Q adds a couple of quite otiose lines, which it filches from Catesby's part at the beginning of the previous act. I am sorry to say that in several instances the Cambridge editors followed the quarto.

Most of the stigmas of a reported text are to be found more or less frequently in the quarto, and they habitually upset the metre. A few typical instances will suffice:

omission

F: God and our innocency defend and guard us!

Q: God and our innocence defend us!

redundancy

F: What, so brief?

'Tis better, sir, than to be tedious.

Q: Yea, are you so brief?

O sir, it is better to be brief than tedious.

paraphrase

F: How now? what mean'st thou, that thou help'st me not?

Q: Why dost thou not help me?

vulgarization (substitution of a clumsier or more commonplace phrase)

F: Come, come; have with you. Wot you what, my lord?

Q: I go. But stay; hear you not the news?

F: It were lost sorrow to wail one that's lost.

Q: It were lost labour to weep for one that's lost.

F: Your gracious self to take on you the charge

And kingly government of this your land . . .

Q: Your gracious self to take on you the sovereignty thereof . . .¹

The only feature of reported texts that does not appear to be found in the quarto is mishearing, of which there is no clear instance.² It is also worth noticing that though several

¹ See addenda, p. 182.

² Chambers speaks of 'some "auditory" errors', but while a few might be of this nature, I do not think that any necessarily are.

unimportant speeches are misassigned, they are never adapted to the wrong speaker as we shall find happen in *King Lear*.

The fact that the quarto of *Richard III* contains a reported text would probably have been recognized long ago had not editors been obsessed on the one hand by the supposed surreptitious character of all quartos (which blinded them to the exceptional features in *Richard III* and *Lear*) and on the other by the idea of literary revision. However, we are still faced with the difficulty of explaining how a report so much better than any of the recognized 'bad' quartos could have been produced. Shorthand has been suggested; but the only systems available in 1597 were those of Bright and Bales. According to Otto Pape¹ the text was taken down in Character by no less than six stenographers of varying ability. The suggestion seems to me utterly fantastic. We are a little hampered by not knowing for certain whether what we have is a report of a somewhat abridged stage-version, or whether the report was itself made for the stage and adapted in the process; but the latter seems on the whole the more probable.² Comparing it with other reports we must take into account the great unevenness of the text in the 'bad' quartos. Though vastly inferior on the whole, that of *Romeo and Juliet* contains pages, and that of *Hamlet* speeches, as good as any in *Richard III*.³ If the agency that produced those passages could have operated at a uniform level, it would have had no difficulty in producing our present text. It follows that if individual actors were instrumental in producing the piracies, the company in general could

¹ *Über die Entstehung der ersten Quarto von Shakespeares Richard III*, Erlangen, 1906.

² The trouble over 'my niece Plantagenet' (see p. 80) suggests that some at least of the cutting was done after the report was made. According to Patrick (p. 19) 'Entrances are usually marked well in advance of the actual movement of the actor', which would also be suggestive if true (see p. 39). But I think there must be some misunderstanding here, for I cannot find a single instance. Possibly Patrick had in mind eleven cases in which a character is marked to enter at the words 'Here comes —' or the like. But I do not think these can be regarded as anticipations (cf. p. 38). In all other cases the character either speaks or is addressed immediately he enters. In point of fact the folio tends to mark entries slightly earlier than the quarto.

³ Or rather in those portions of the text for which the folio offers an independent criterion (see below, p. 87).

perfectly well have produced from memory the quarto text of *Richard III*; and like Patrick I am driven to conclude that this is actually what happened. An occasion is provided by the restraint of London acting in the summer of 1597, which sent the Chamberlain's men with others into the country. They were in Kent in August, at Bristol in September. Their numbers were presumably reduced and their repertory limited. We may suppose that when they wished to act *Richard III* they found that the prompt-book had remained in London. It would have been some trouble to fetch it, and it would anyhow have needed altering to fit their smaller cast; so instead they reconstructed it by an effort of communal memory, adapting it at the same time to altered circumstances. The absence of some of the minor actors who had taken part in the performance in London was made up for by the presence of the book-keeper, who had a general knowledge of the dialogue and could regulate the succession of the scenes. He would be more likely than the actors themselves to conflate their parts. On their return to London some time in the autumn¹ they would have no further use for the improvised prompt-book: it may have gone astray, or it may have been deliberately sold for publication, perhaps with the idea of forestalling piracy, a fate that overtook *Romeo and Juliet* the same year. In any case the play was duly entered in the Stationers' Register on 20 October.

I said above that I should assume that the folio represented an authoritative playhouse manuscript. Actually it was not printed from the manuscript itself but mostly from a copy of the sixth quarto, 1622, which had been extensively corrected by comparison with it.² No doubt it was intended to bring the copy into complete agreement with the manuscript, though there were certainly occasional failures in the

¹ The Admiral's men reopened at the Rose on 11 October.

² This was detected by P. A. Daniel, who pointed out that F reproduces a number of errors and dubious readings peculiar to Q6. Actually his instances do not prove his conclusion, since, as Patrick remarks (p. 150), they might be due to the compositor having consulted Q6 when in difficulty over the manuscript. However, the actual use of the quarto as copy seems to be proved by iv. iv. 364, a line correctly given in Q1, omitted in Q6, and misplaced in F, showing that it had been inserted, and wrongly inserted, in the copy. Curiously enough Daniel failed to appreciate the significance of Q3, which Chambers also ignores.

execution. This relation holds for the bulk of the text. There are however two passages, the first 164 lines or so of Act III and the last 357½ lines of Act V,¹ which in the folio were printed almost without alteration from the third quarto, 1602. It looks as though two leaves had been lost from the middle and four from the end of the prompt-book at some fairly early date and the gaps made good by the insertion of leaves from the handiest edition. Presumably the manuscript was old and worn and was being destroyed in preparing the copy for the folio: the printed leaves it contained were abstracted and substituted in the copy in order to save transcribing the few prompter's notes they bore.²

Of the exact nature of the manuscript it is difficult to speak with confidence. That it had actually been used on the stage is evident from the prompter's notes just mentioned, and others of a similar sort no doubt occurred sporadically throughout. They appear however to overlie original author's directions (e.g. 'in rotten armour marvellous ill-favoured', which comes from the chronicles) and even so leave them at many points inadequate for production.³ There is also some variation in the speakers' names. These features point to fairly close dependence on foul papers, and this is perhaps as much as can safely be said concerning a play of early date and so strange a textual history.⁴

¹ Beginning with the second half of v. iii. 48.

² That the leaves of Q₃ were used to supply defects in the manuscript and not in Q₆ appears from the fact that the passages in question do not correspond to whole pages, less still to whole leaves, in either Q₃ or Q₆; moreover, as mentioned above, they appear to have contained a few directions by the prompter, which thus found their way into F. The use of Q₃ for these passages was first pointed out by Schmidt.

³ See appendix (p. 170).

⁴ Two minor points concerning the quarto may be mentioned here. One is that two lines of the current text (1. i. 101-2) appear for the first time in Q₂, 1598. They are there inserted, as they might have been in proof, in such a manner as not to disturb the page-for-page agreement of the quarto with its copy. Now, whether the lines are genuine or not (and it is relevant to observe that they were retained in F) it is difficult to account for their addition in Q₂, which is everywhere else a slavish reprint of Q₁. It has therefore been conjectured (by A. W. Pollard) that they may in fact have been added to Q₁ in the course of printing and have stood in a state of the sheet (sig. A) which happens not to be preserved among the four copies known. The suggestion is of considerable interest as showing how an edition of no intrinsic authority may yet contain as a variant an original and authoritative reading.

There is also a bibliographical curiosity about the play that I am tempted to

The editorial implications of this history are curious and complicated. F is of course the generally authoritative text. Where however it is dependent on Q₃ it becomes derivative, and for these passages Q₁ is the ultimate authority, except for the few notes added by the book-keeper. Elsewhere, whenever F differs from Q₆ and there is no reason to suspect an error of the corrector or compositor, it must be taken to reproduce the manuscript and preserve the words of the author.¹ Readings in which F agrees with Q₆ against Q₁, unless the latter is obviously corrupt, are to be supposed due to imperfect correction of the copy, and the reading of Q₁ should be restored. Where F agrees with both quartos its authority is less than where it differs; for we know that it took over a number of errors peculiar to Q₆, and there is therefore every reason to suppose that it also took over errors that Q₆ had inherited from Q₁. It follows that readings in which F has the support of the earlier texts, instead of being the best authenticated, are just the most vulnerable to criticism and open to emendation.

KING LEAR

We have in *King Lear* another play of which the quarto and folio texts differ widely though not so widely as the 'bad' and 'good' quartos of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet*. The difference rather resembles what we found in *Richard III*, but it is appreciably greater. Moreover in the case of *Lear* editors agree in regarding the folio as the better text and as presumably representing the prompt copy. It is in their explanation of the general inferiority of the quarto that they differ. Revision has of course been the favourite solution.

mention though it can presumably be of no textual significance. The entrance in the Stationers' Register was made by Andrew Wise, and according to the title-page the first quarto was printed for him by Valentine Simmes. But Colonel Frank Isaac has pointed out to me that Simmes printed only a little over half the book, sheets A to G to be exact. After this the type changes (at III. vii. 54) and sheets H to M were probably printed by Peter Short in a fount he inherited from Denham and used again in his edition of 1 *Henry IV* the following year. The change of type can be observed even in the very poor facsimile.

¹ A slight reservation is here necessary in view of the fact that either the manuscript itself or F underwent some 'reformation' in the matter of profanity, no doubt in consequence of the Act of 27 May 1606 'to Restrain Abuses of Players'. The reformation extends to the passages dependent on Q₃.

The most elaborate investigation is that by Miss Doran,¹ whose work on *Henry VI* I have already had occasion to mention. According to her the quarto was printed from Shakespeare's autograph, a manuscript already confused and illegible from much correction and alteration, and thrown aside as worthless when, as a result of a further thorough revision, the play had taken final shape in the prompt-book. This theory is of course, like all of its kind, open to the initial objection, to which I have more than once alluded, that we have no evidence whatever that such persistent and wholesale revision was anything but exceptional in Elizabethan dramaturgy, and further that it appears particularly unlikely in the work of so fluent a writer as Shakespeare. And when it comes to a detailed examination of the texts, I find myself unable to imagine any competent author, least of all Shakespeare—and moreover Shakespeare, not in his apprentice stage as in *Richard III*, but at the very height of his powers—writing the clumsy and tentative lines we find in the quarto, apparently groping after his expression and even his meaning with the hesitancy of a novice. The quarto is, I am convinced, derivative. Nor can I believe that the folio represents a conceivable revision. That Shakespeare should add or delete or recast or touch up is conceivable; but that he should rewrite a play in order to make a lot of verbal alterations is surely not in character, whereas to suggest that the many trivial and indifferent variants were deliberately inserted as corrections into the manuscript as it stood seems to me merely fantastic.²

What I believe to be the true origin of the quarto was once again suggested by Alexander Schmidt in 1879, the year before he applied the same theory to *Richard III*.³ He declared it to be another reported text, somehow based on

¹ *The Text of 'King Lear'*, Stanford University Publications, Language and Literature (IV. 2), 1931.

² Had structural recasting ever necessitated rewriting a play throughout, I have no doubt that in doing so Shakespeare would both consciously and unconsciously have made all sorts of small alterations in the text, many of which would have seemed to us indifferent and unmotivated. But there is no suggestion of any structural necessity for revision in either *Richard III* or *Lear*.

³ Schmidt believed that all the quartos were reports, and *Lear* and *Richard III* naturally offered a convenient foundation on which to build his case.

actual performance; and if I now make bold to maintain this long-dormant theory, I am this time happy in the agreement of no less an authority than Chambers. Besides frequent and often indifferent variants, we find in the quarto all the usual stigmas of a reported text: redundancy, whether through the actors' introduction of vocatives, expletives, or connective phrases, or through their lapsing into looser and more commonplace phraseology, merging into paraphrase; anticipation, recollection, and assimilation; vulgarization, and mere breakdown through failure of memory. A few examples will illustrate different kinds of degeneration.

The two forms of redundancy unite in a line that is typical of a good many others:

F: I am made of that self metal as my sister . . .

Q: Sir, I am made of the selfsame metal that my sister is . . .

The loosening of the texture is obvious: the vigorous phrase 'that self metal' suggests to the actor's mind the familiar 'selfsame' that comes so glibly from his tongue. The verse itself stamps the folio as correct, and surely original: it seems incredible that the Globe edition (though not the Cambridge) should have preferred the quarto reading. More extensive insertions are to be seen in

F: *Lear*. . . . Thou shalt find

That I'll resume the shape which thou dost think

I have cast off for ever [*Q adds: , thou shalt, I warrant thee*].

Goneril.

Do you mark that [*Q adds: , my lord*]?

('I have cast off for ever.—Do you mark that?' is of course one metrical line.) A further point to observe is that these connective and redundant phrases tend to be borrowed or repeated from neighbouring passages, such assimilation being a natural trick of imperfect memory.¹ Thus in the first scene *Lear* twice admonishes Cordelia in lines that run in F:

Nothing will come of nothing; speak again

and

How, how, Cordelia? Mend your speech a little,

¹ In *Richard III* repetition and parallelism of phrase is a deliberate rhetorical device of composition, and it is therefore less easy to apply this criterion of reporting. But there is nothing similar in the mature writing of *Lear*.

where Q borrows 'How' from the second to prefix unmetrically to the first, and gives the second in the form:

Go to, go to! Mend your speech a little,

using a fretful exclamation that it inserts again and unmetrically later in the scene:

[Go to, go to!] Better thou

Hadst not been born than not t' have pleased me better

(where 'Better thou' properly completes the line that begins 'Hath lost me in your liking').

One form of vulgarization is exaggeration. Gross minds, like immature, seek to impress by overstatement. When Kent, jibing at Oswald, says 'A tailor made thee', he explains:

a stonecutter or a painter could not have made him so ill, though they had been but two years o'th' trade.

This is sober sense: Shakespeare knows that art is long. But to the actor and to the groundling two years seems an age: so the quarto substitutes 'two hours', which is absurd. Actors' bombast and vociferation have also left their mark on the quarto.

An obvious indication of reporting is failure of memory. Here is a passage in which Q stands condemned by the metre: F reads,

Why brand they us

With base, with baseness, bastardy, base, base?

The verse is correct, but it is not an easy line to memorize exactly, and it is no surprise to find in Q the syncopated form 'With base, base bastardy?' There is no reason why a scribe or compositor should have produced this, nor is it likely that Shakespeare would have originally written this short line in the middle of a perfectly regular speech and then padded it out.¹ Again, failure of memory alone can, it seems to me, account for the following. When in the first

¹ The speech is printed as prose in Q, but apart from this line and one omission the words are substantially correct.

scene Lear at last turns to Cordelia he addresses her in the tender words:

Now, our joy,
Although our last and least! to whose young love
The vines of France and milk of Burgundy
Strive to be interest . . .

In place of this Q only has:

But now, our joy,
Although the last, not least in our dear love . . .

Surely it was the loss of a line and a half that occasioned the reconstruction.¹

But it is largely on the verbal variants that the case for reporting must rest. It is generally admitted that where these are not indifferent the folio usually has the better reading. This of course is what we should expect if the quarto is an actors' text, for when an actor substitutes another word for the author's it will usually be a feebler one, though now and then it may give a smoother or easier reading that will commend it to editors. I believe that with few exceptions the folio preserves the original reading, and that this can often be proved. Let us begin with one or two indifferent readings. Consider this:

Five [Q: Four] days we do allot thee for provision
To shield thee from disasters [Q: diseases] of the world,
And on the sixth [Q: fifth] to turn thy hated back
Upon our kingdom . . .

It is no doubt conceivable that a compositor might print 'diseases' for 'disasters' or *vice versa*, or even that an author might substitute one for the other in revision. But the numbers, indifferent in themselves, are consistently varied, and here neither explanation seems satisfactory. Moreover it is curious how often what at first sight appears to be an indifferent variant in the quarto is condemned by a further examination of the text. Sometimes it is found to be an actor's assimilation. In 'O vassal! miscreant!' where Q has

¹ The corruption was no doubt helped by the familiarity of the phrase 'last not least', which was already established as a popular arcadianism. Indeed it seems to have been occasioned by an actor's reminiscence of *Julius Caesar*, III. i. 189, 'Though last, not least in love'.

'recreant', the latter anticipates 'Hear me, recreant!' six lines later, where Q omits the word: in 'Love's not love When it is mingled with regards [Q: respects]', the variant anticipates [Q] 'respects of fortune are his love', nine lines below: whereas in 'Thou [Q: thy blood] hotly lusts to use her in that kind', the unmetrical reading of Q seems to contain a recollection of 'hold thy bloody hand' just before. Sometimes there is a subtle difference of meaning that escaped the actor or reporter. When Goneril says, 'This milky gentleness and course of yours Though I condemn not [Q: dislike not]', she makes a concession to decency in saying that she does not condemn the gentlemanly behaviour of her husband—it would never occur to her to pretend to like it. Sometimes the sense or at least the implication of the words has been mistaken. Cordelia's parting injunction to her sisters, 'Love [Q: Use] well our father', means simply: Make good your professions of love—she had yet no ground for supposing they would use the old man ill. But to an actor familiar with the sequel 'Use' would come naturally enough. So Oswald, egged on by Regan to murder Gloucester, says:

Would I could meet him, madam; I should show
What party I do follow.

Q has 'What lady I do follow', and since their talk has been of the rivalry between the sisters, the words would seem appropriate enough to an actor: but it is of course the 'British party' that the author means.

I hope I have said enough to show that the features of the first quarto of *King Lear* are such as to make reporting a reasonable hypothesis. They are generally similar to what we found in *Richard III*: there are however also some marked differences. In that play the folio text is about 200 lines longer than the quarto: here the quarto text is longer than the folio by a like amount. This seems due to the two versions having been differently cut for acting: I may mention that at one point (III. i. 29–30), where Q and F present alternative texts, the cutting appears to have overlapped, so that a portion of the text is irretrievably lost. Perhaps that does not matter much in an inferior scene of a

very long play.¹ Another difference is that the repetitions and borrowings are all, I think, from neighbouring passages; there are no anticipations or recollections of lines from distant parts of the play: in other words they are of a type that might occur in representation and do not involve the supposition that the text was reconstructed from memory.

I mentioned before that there appear to be no mistakes of the ear or serious confusion between speakers in *Richard III*: both are found in *Lear*. Of course, as is now recognized, the mental substitutions of a compositor may sometimes have the appearance of mishearings. We could imagine him printing, as in Q:

No blown ambition doth our arms in sight,

even if his copy correctly read 'incite', as in F. But it is more difficult to believe that it was he who converted 'a dog's obeyed in office' (F) into 'a dog, so bade in office' (Q). The following:

F: Striving to better, oft we mar what's well

Q: Striving to better ought, we mar what's well

may puzzle us till we remember that Shakespeare rimes *oft* and *nought* (just as he rimes *after* and *daughter* in the same scene). These are no freakish misprints, it would seem, for in both passages the punctuation has been accommodated to the false sense—though this might indeed have been done by a press reader. Once mishearing is admitted it may be seen in a number of other instances, of which the most amusing is the conversion of the 'mopping and mowing' of chambermaids into the devils 'Mobing and Mohing' in a passage omitted by the folio.

Speeches assigned to the wrong speaker are not very numerous, still there seem to be three or four clear instances. They are not mere slips, for the words have sometimes been altered to fit the speaker; and this has led to some dispute as to which assignment is correct. There can I think be no doubt about the following. When smouldering jealousies suddenly flame up in the last scene, Regan urges Edmund to use her army

¹ It may of course have happened at other points where it cannot now be detected.

to make good his claim to her hand, with the words (in F):

Let the drum strike, and prove my title thine

(i.e. do thou prove); whereas in Q it is Edmund himself who says:

Let the drum strike and prove my title good

which is nonsense—a drum can prove nothing but its capacity for noise.

Now, errors of the ear and misassignment of speeches are blunders that may easily be made by a reporter attending a performance; they are less likely to arise if a body of actors endeavour to reconstruct from memory a play they have been in the habit of performing. We are already being driven to look for an origin of the *Lear* quarto different from that suggested for *Richard III*. A last piece of evidence should clinch the matter.

The most obvious characteristics of the quarto of *Lear* are its disregard of metre and its inadequate and often erroneous punctuation. Chambers remarks that 'mislineation is a constant feature of Q. . . . Occasionally it is altogether unmetrical. Prose is printed as verse. Still more often is verse printed as prose . . . Q has practically no punctuation except commas.' Of course misrepresentation of metre may arise from a variety of causes; and we know that manuscripts were often inadequately punctuated. But what we find in the *Lear* quarto is altogether abnormal for a printed book. We could well imagine that the printer had before him copy that was altogether without punctuation or metrical division, and that the different treatment it received in the several parts of the play was due to the different degree of skill shown by several compositors. Such copy would naturally result from a shorthand report, and I do not know what else would produce it.¹

I know all the objections to the theory of shorthand reporting, for I have often argued them myself. The text is too long to have been acted in the time allowed on the Elizabethan stage; it would have been impossible to make a steno-

¹ This contention is further developed in an article on "King Lear"—Mislineation and Stenography' in *The Library*, 1936, xvii. 172. Of course punctuation and division may have been introduced by the reporter in making his longhand transcript, but that would not make them less conjectural.

graphic report unobserved in an Elizabethan theatre; no available system would have been capable of producing so accurate a report. But there are possible answers. The evidence does not force us to believe that all performances were restricted to anything like two hours: we know that some given at court lasted much longer. Moreover at such a special performance a reporter, if he got in, would be more difficult to detect and also more difficult to remove—and we know that *Lear* was acted at court.¹ As regards the system of shorthand used I must differ from Dr. J. Q. Adams, who has argued in detail in favour of Bright's Character.² That this could have furnished a report such as we find in the quarto of *Lear* I cannot believe: but since 1602 there had been available Willis's Stenography, an admittedly superior system, which Heywood asserted to have been actually used for the pirating of plays. I must leave it at that, for in this instance I cannot but conclude that some kind of shorthand was employed, however little I like the conclusion.³

That the folio represents a playhouse manuscript is fairly evident and indeed is hardly disputed. As I said, it has been cut for performance, and the cuts are on the whole judicious: 'I could better believe that Shakespeare cut it than wrote it', Granville-Barker says of an omitted scene (iv. iii).⁴ There is a complete division into acts and scenes, and I may mention incidentally that this seems to belong to the original composition, and moreover that the play was apparently written for performance on a stage that lacked the usual alcove at the back and presumably the balcony above it.⁵ It is however doubtful whether the folio text was actually printed from the manuscript. Opinions differ, but in mine there can be no

¹ The representation given at court (on 26 Dec. 1606) was probably not the first. But I believe the play to have been originally written for a private performance (see below) and this may have afforded equally good opportunities.

² *Modern Philology*, 1933, xxxi. 135. See a reply by M. Doran in the same, 1935, xxxiii. 139.

³ Shorthand would of course seem to imply piracy: at the same time the entrance in the Stationers' Register is perfectly normal, and was made under the hand of Sir George Buc, which suggests authorized publication (cf. p. 107). There may however have been a special licence to print (cf. p. 113, note).

⁴ *Prefaces to Shakespeare*, First Series, 1927, p. 228.

⁵ *R.E.S.*, 1940, xvi. 300. Crompton Rhodes observed this, but drew the conclusion that the play had been 'revised for a special revival' (*Shakespeare's First Folio*, p. 109).

doubt that it was actually set up from a copy of the first quarto, the so-called 'Pied Bull' quarto of 1608, which had been elaborately corrected, cut, and supplemented, by comparison with the manuscript. It was P. A. Daniel who first put forward this view,¹ and although with respect to individual passages his argument was not always sound, I think that sufficient can be established to supplement what Chambers calls 'a continuance of errors and a general orthographic resemblance' in the construction of a convincing case.²

I must mention to begin with that copies of the first quarto differ among themselves in a remarkable number of passages—about 150 readings are involved—owing to the type having been corrected as the sheets went through the press.³ Now, we know, from the nature of the alterations themselves, that some are genuine corrections restoring the reading of the copy, while others are mere guesses at points where neither the compositor nor the corrector could decipher the writing. All twelve extant copies show a mixture of corrected and uncorrected sheets; and if the folio was printed from a copy of the quarto, this too no doubt contained samples of both. If therefore we find the folio either reproducing an original error of the quarto compositor for which the corrector substituted the true reading, or else reproducing an alteration by the corrector that is no true reading but an arbitrary guess, it will follow that the folio was printed from a corrected copy of the quarto and not directly from the manuscript. The presence of both can I believe be demonstrated.⁴

¹ Introduction to the Praetorius facsimile of Q1, 1885.

² That there is some direct connexion between Q1 and F seems certain, and the possibility considered (p. 86, note 2) in *Richard III*, that the compositor of F merely referred to Q1 when in difficulty, appears to be excluded by frequent coincidence in spelling and punctuation and by distinct bibliographical links, features not found in the earlier play.

³ See *The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear'*, Bibliographical Society, 1940. For a somewhat more detailed outline of the textual theory suggested in this lecture, see a paper on 'The Function of Bibliography in Literary Criticism illustrated in a Study of the Text of "King Lear"' in *Neophilologus*, 1933, xviii. 241.

⁴ Of course examples of the two must not occur in passages belonging to the same sheet (or more precisely to the same forme) of the quarto, or their evidence will be mutually destructive.

There is a speech of Edmund's (in sheet K) the opening lines of which should run as follows:

Sir, I thought it fit
To send the old and miserable king
To some retention and appointed guard,
Whose age had charms in it, whose title more,
To pluck the common bosom on his side . . .

Here the half-line 'and appointed guard', which is necessary to the verse and I think unquestionably genuine, was supplied by the press reader in the corrected state of the quarto text. The compositor had omitted it, and he moreover set up the previous line and a half as a single line of type. But the half-line is again missing in the folio, and the preceding line and a half appear in the same impossible form. The natural inference is that in this passage the folio compositor had before him an uncorrected copy of the quarto sheet, in which the error had been overlooked when it was collated with the prompt-book, either through carelessness or because the manuscript was defective at this point.

On the other hand, Goneril (in sheet D) addresses her milder husband Albany in words that run in the folio (after correction of one trifling misprint):

No no, my lord,
This milky gentleness and course of yours
Though I condemn not, yet, under pardon,
You are much more at task for want of wisdom
Than praised for harmful mildness.

The words 'at task' are open to suspicion. There is no record of such a phrase elsewhere, and it seems hardly capable of bearing the required meaning (viz. taken to task, blamed): moreover a participle seems required to balance 'praised'. This the corrected state of the quarto sheet supplies in the word 'attaskt'. But this cannot have been the reading of the copy, for the compositor originally set up the impossible word 'alapt', and behind 'alapt' there must, on well-known graphic principles, have been the form 'ataxt'.¹ Now,

¹ The confusion of *t* and *l* is particularly common in the quarto, while *x* and *p* are often indistinguishable in Elizabethan secretary hands.

ataxed, i.e. taxed, is at least as fitting in the context as *atasked*, i.e. taken to task; though in fact neither is elsewhere recorded. It follows that 'attaskt' is a ghost word invented by the press reader, and when the folio editor or compositor further altered it to 'at task', he proved that he had before him a corrected sheet of the quarto, for the word existed nowhere else.

The following is an instance of typically erroneous punctuation in the quarto surviving in the folio. Immediately after his rejection of Cordelia, Lear exclaims:

Call France! Who stirs?
Call Burgundy! Cornwall and Albany,
With my two daughters' dowers digest the third . . .

This the folio renders unintelligible by following exactly the pointing of the quarto:

call France, who stirs?
Call Burgundy, Cornwall, and Albany, . . .

I should like to add that there is some difference in the character of the stage directions as they appear in the two texts. The quarto, as we should expect from a report, tends to describe action as seen by the spectator: 'She takes a sword and runs at him behind' is an instance. The folio, on the contrary, often preserves the terse orders of the prompter: 'Kills him' is all it offers in the same passage. It is therefore significant when we find the descriptive direction, 'Enter Lear with Cordelia in his arms', agreeing *literatim* in the two texts.¹

Naturally the folio contains printers' errors that can be removed by comparison with the quarto. Furthermore, in the prompt-book itself a difficult or obsolescent word appears now and again to have been altered on the occasion of some later production: or possibly these substitutions should be ascribed to 'the sophisticating editor' of the folio, as Chambers calls him, whose hand can be traced in many plays. Two examples occur close together in a speech of Gloucester's in III. vii:

In his anointed flesh stick boarish fangs

¹ See appendix (p. 172).

where the quarto's 'rash boarish fangs' is I think certainly original, and

If wolves had at thy gate howled that stern time,

where the same may be said of the quarto's 'dern time'. I suspect another instance where according to the folio Flibbertigibbet 'squints the eye and makes the hare-lip'. In place of 'squints' the corrected state of the quarto has 'squemes', which may be a misprint for 'squenies', a dialect form of the word, which as 'squiny' occurs elsewhere in the play. But the compositor originally set up 'queues', which may have been an error for 'squenies', yet another dialectal form, conveniently preserved for us in two pamphlets of 1608 and 1609 by Robert Armin. Armin had the best possible opportunity of picking up the word from this very passage, for he himself played the Fool in *Lear* and was on the stage when it was spoken.

The general conclusion therefore is that the quarto is a reported text, badly printed and arbitrarily corrected, of small textual value. The folio is based on the prompt-book,¹ and is of high authority; however, it was not printed from the manuscript, but from a copy of the quarto that had been brought into general though not complete conformity with it. The consequences for an editor are clear if rather paradoxical, and are much the same as in *Richard III*; namely that where our two authorities differ we have better warrant for the text than where they agree, since in the former case the reading of the folio must (accidents apart) be that of the prompt-book, whereas in the latter the folio may have taken over an error from the quarto. Acceptance of this conclusion would affect the current text in two ways. In the first place there would be a general restoration of folio readings that

¹ Clearly I think the prompt-book and not the author's manuscript, to judge from the directions. There is slight inconsistency in the use of 'Edmund' and 'Bastard' in directions and speech headings, but this is more likely due to the influence of Q. Possibly the manuscript had 'Edmund' throughout. (Note that at the end of I. ii where there is an addition in F we find *Edm.* replacing *Bast.* as prefix.) Kent's confused speech at the end of II. ii (170-81) looks indeed like an author's unresolved tangle, but except for three errors it is found verbatim in Q. There appears to have been some reduction in the number of actors needed for minor parts in F (Doran, pp. 79-80).

editors have displaced in favour of the quarto. The Globe text of *Lear* must contain some four hundred quarto readings (apart from passages preserved only in the quarto) of which perhaps three hundred would go. This would involve some loss of smoothness, but I believe a surprising accession of vigour. In the second place, by depriving the agreement of quarto and folio of its supposed authority, it would open the way to much greater freedom of emendation than would else be proper. And what use editors would make of that is perhaps, like the ways of providence, better only guessing.

V. THE 'GOOD' QUARTOS

WE have already considered four quartos commonly classed as 'good'. *Richard III* and *King Lear* proved to be reported texts, to which the epithet could only be applied out of courtesy, since they are very much better than the recognized 'bad' quartos. *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet* we found to have been printed from the author's own drafts, or 'foul papers' as they were called.

This last conclusion is interesting in connexion with a theory put forward by McKerrow some years ago to account for the frequent textual corruption or at least difficulty that we find in many, though by no means in all, Elizabethan plays.¹ He pointed out that in other departments of literature Elizabethan books appear as a rule to be quite accurately printed, apart from ordinary typographical errors; so that it is evident that compositors were perfectly capable of producing a generally satisfactory text if they were furnished with straightforward copy. But prompt copies of plays, which had to be read by the censor and used to regulate performances, would not only need to be legible but to contain straightforward texts: moreover actual prompt-books that have survived do not as a rule contain serious cruxes. There is no reason therefore why plays printed from prompt copies should present difficulties of a major kind. If however a company of players wished to provide the printer with copy for publication, they would naturally be loath to part with their prompt-book, which in the Master of the Revels' licence bore their authority for performance, and which might moreover be in current use on the stage; they would prefer to hand over, if they had it, the author's rough copy, from which the prompt-book had actually been prepared. Such foul papers would very likely be ill written, would probably contain many deletions and alterations, and might even in some places never have been reduced to final shape. Copy of this sort would no doubt provide the book-

¹ 'The Elizabethan Printer and Dramatic Manuscripts', *The Library*, 1931, xii. 253.

keeper or an experienced playhouse scrivener with the material he needed to compile a suitable acting version, but it would set many problems to a compositor. The inference is that a play the text of which contains many cruxes may very likely have been printed from the author's autograph.

This theory can be linked up with another penetrating observation of McKerrow's.¹ He drew attention to the fact that in some of the early editions of Shakespeare's plays there is a remarkable lack of consistency in the speech prefixes, while in others there is almost complete uniformity. And he suggested, I think with much plausibility, that an author when he is writing, so long as he gets the characters he wants onto the stage, will give comparatively little thought to what he calls them or to how he distinguishes their speeches. He may use abbreviations, perhaps inadequate, of their names; or it may be the function of a character that will be uppermost in his mind, and he may use this as a designation. For example, in the 'good' quarto of *Romeo and Juliet* the heroine's father is generally *Capulet*, but when he is talking to her he becomes *Father*; her mother is once *Lady of the House* in a stage direction when engaged in domestic duties, and as a speaker may be either *Wife*, *Capulet's Wife*, *Old Lady*, *Lady*, or *Mother* (and as the last appear simply as *Mo.* or *M.*). This would cause inconvenience if allowed to survive in the prompt-book; and those plays in which there is greater uniformity may perhaps be supposed to have gone through some process of editing.

I suggested a moment ago that the foul papers of an author might contain passages that had not been reduced to final form. These would probably be tidied up by whoever prepared the prompt copy. Such a passage is to be found in the three pages of *Sir Thomas More* that I am not alone in believing to be in Shakespeare's own handwriting. In it the author originally wrote (disregarding two alterations made *currente calamo*):

Wash your foul minds with tears and those same hands
That you like rebels lift against the peace
Lift up for peace, and your unreverent knees

¹ 'A Suggestion regarding Shakespeare's Manuscripts', *R.E.S.*, 1935, xi. 459.

THE 'GOOD' QUARTOS

Make them your feet[;] to kneel to be forgiven
 Is safer wars, than ever you can make
 Whose discipline is riot; why even your wars
 Cannot proceed but by obedience[.] What rebel captain[;]
 As mutinies are incident, by his name
 Can still the rout[?] who will obey a traitor[?]

(I have introduced in brackets some necessary stops.) But he was apparently dissatisfied with this as it stood, which is not altogether surprising. First, he noticed that he had 'wars' twice in consecutive lines, so he altered the second to 'hurly' (this may have been done in the course of writing). Further, the idea of kneeling being a safe form of warfare was a very strained conceit, and one line was much too long. He started by interlining 'in[,] in to your obedience.', presumably as a substitute for 'why even your hurly Cannot proceed but by obedience'. But this did not mend matters much, nor in fact did he delete the original line and a half. Instead he seems to have lost patience and given up all attempt to reduce the passage to order. The book-keeper made short work of the muddle. He drew his pen through everything from 'is safer wars' down to 'but by obedience', interlined 'tell me but this', and left the passage to read intelligibly if rather lamely and tamely:

... and your unreverent knees
 Make them your feet to kneel to be forgiven[.]
 Tell me but this[,] what rebel captain . . .

If a compositor had been called upon to deal with the lines before they were thus tidied up, he would inevitably have produced one of those passages of inextricable confusion that we occasionally meet with in the early editions of Shakespeare's plays.¹

¹ I ought perhaps to mention that so good a critic as A. W. Pollard (*A Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, p. 275) appears to be satisfied with the passage as written, since he speaks of 'the two and a half lines needlessly struck out' by the book-keeper and of 'his silly little insertion'. Nevertheless he does not attempt to explain how the 'unassimilated interlineation' was to be worked in and how he imagines Shakespeare intended the text finally to stand. Instead he remarks: 'The passage suggests that the bookkeeper in Shakespeare's theatre may have done considerably more harm to the text of the plays than editors have guessed!' I do not think it is quite fair to represent the book-keeper's incursion as wanton interference.

I may mention that the same three pages throw light on the practice regarding speakers' names. The first begins with an harangue by a popular leader who is subjected to interruptions by the crowd. These interjections the author gives simply to an 'other' (reduced through 'oth' to 'o') and leaves the book-keeper to distribute them individually. Similarly he fails to differentiate between two brothers of the name of Betts, content that the book-keeper should distinguish them as George and Clown respectively.

Of course Shakespeare was not the only dramatist who sometimes omitted to tidy up the text of his foul papers. I think we may find an instance of the same negligence or oversight in a play of Chapman's, *An Humorous Day's Mirth*, published in 1599.¹ The passage in question is printed as prose, like the rest of the verse in this play: divided and re-punctuated but not otherwise amended it runs:

Oh, how you are deceived! You have but me,
And what a trouble am I to your joy!
But, father, if you long to have some fruit of me,
See, father, I will creep into this stubborn earth
And mix my flesh with it, and they shall breed
Grass to fat oxen, asses, and such-like;
And when they in the grass the spring converts
Into beasts' nourishment,
Then comes the fruit of this my body forth;
Then may you well say,
Seeing my race is so profitably increased,
That good fat ox and that same large-eared ass
Are my son sons, that calf with a white face
Is his fair daughter; with which when your fields
Are richly filled, then will my race content you.

The conceit may not be wholly to our taste, but the writing is characteristic enough and not lacking in vigour. It is plain however from the repetitions and the breakdown of grammar and metre that the passage cannot have been

¹ Malone Society reprint, 1938, introduction. The play was acted as new by the Admiral's men on 11 May 1597. There is no entry of it in the Stationers' Register, and the edition may not have been authorized. But the nature of the manuscript behind it is evident. There is a good deal of confusion between speakers, apparently the result of ambiguous abbreviation of prefixes.

meant to stand as it now appears. Exactly by what process of revision and interlineation it reached its present chaotic state it is impossible to say; but it is not difficult to guess how the book-keeper who tidied up Shakespeare's contribution to *Sir Thomas More* would have dealt with the case. We can imagine him leaving some such smooth version as this:

Oh, how you are deceived! You have but me,
 And what a trouble am I to your joy!
 But if you long to have some fruit of me,
 See, I will creep into this stubborn earth
 And mix my flesh with it, and they shall breed;
 These when the spring converts to nourishment
 Then comes the fruit of this my body forth,
 And you may say,
 Seeing my race so profitably increased,
 That good fat ox and that same large-eared ass
 Are my son's sons, that calf with a white face
 Is his fair daughter; with which when your fields
 Are richly filled, then will my race content you.

Before proceeding I wish to raise a point about the manuscripts presented at Stationers' Hall for registration. It happens that in a few instances the actual form of the entry, namely 'a book called the book of' so-and-so,¹ enables us to infer that the copy submitted was the actual prompt-book from the theatre. We shall find an instance in *The Merchant of Venice*: *Pericles* is another. Much more often from 1607 onwards we find plays entered 'under the hand' of the Master of the Revels, a post held during the latter part of Shakespeare's career by Sir George Buc.² What exactly does this mean? Did Buc license these plays for printing? It is true that at a later date Herbert claimed that plays should be submitted to him for printing as well as for acting, but it is not clear how far this claim was ever re-

¹ Implying of course that the manuscript was inscribed 'The Book of —': cf. p. 34.

² Buc's name first appears as authority for the entrance of a play, *The Fleece*, on 21 Nov. 1606, and is generally found (sometimes replaced by that of his deputy Segar) from 10 Apr. 1607 to 22 Feb. 1622. Tilney's appears in a belated entry of 29 June 1607. Ashley's appears on 20 Jan. and 3 Sept. 1623: Herbert's first on 12 Mar. 1624, but not again till 7 Nov. 1627, after which it is found regularly for ten years.

cognized, still less that Buc enforced it.¹ My belief is that at any rate in the first quarter of the seventeenth century the Wardens of the Company took the responsibility for allowing the entrance of any play which had been licensed for acting by the Master of the Revels.² If that is so we can again assume that when Buc's name appears in an entry it was as a rule the licensed prompt-book that was presented at Stationers' Hall, and consequently that the publication was authorized by the company owning the play. It might be further argued that in these cases it was the prompt copy itself that was handed over to the printer. But I cannot believe in such a wholesale surrender of prompt-books. It seems more likely that what normally happened was that the licensed 'book' was submitted as authority for the publication, and that entrance having been duly made, some other manuscript was supplied to the printer as copy.³

We have ten quartos to consider in this lecture. Seven are allowed by all critics to have been used as copy for the corresponding plays in the folio. I will begin with the three plays, namely 2 *Henry IV*, *Troilus and Cressida*, and *Othello*—to name them in the order of their appearance—in which the divergence between the two texts is greatest, and of which

¹ See J. Q. Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, pp. 40-1. In the *Works of Fulke Greville*, Lord Brooke, 1633, the tragedy of *Alaham* bears at the end Herbert's licence dated 23 June 1632; it was entered under his hand with the rest of the works (licensed by him on 17 Oct.) on 10 Nov. 1632. Herbert's licence dated 14 Jan. is printed at the end of Shirley's *Witty Fair One*, 1633; this was entered the following day under his hand. Lastly Davenant's *Platonic Lovers* and *The Wits*, 1636, entered on 4 Feb., each bears Herbert's licence dated 19 Jan. These are all licences to *print*. I have not noticed any other instances. In 1608 Chapman complained that Buc had censored his *Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles Duke of Byron* for the press after it had been allowed for acting (Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, iii. 258): but the case was exceptional. A late deposition states that in 1611 Buc licensed *A King and no King* for printing as well as for acting (Adams, pp. 105, 112): in fact the play was not entered till 7 Aug. 1618 (under Buc's hand) and first printed in 1619. Presumably there was nothing to prevent the Master of the Revels granting a licence for printing. (See addenda, p. 182.)

² As suggested by Crompton Rhodes, *Shakespeare's First Folio*, pp. 27-31. The view is rather hesitatingly endorsed by Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, i. 100, 129.

³ *Pericles* we have seen was certainly not printed from the prompt-book—but then neither was it in pursuance of Blount's entrance that the play was published—and it is doubtful whether *The Merchant of Venice* was either.

the folio text has therefore generally been thought to have been printed independently from a manuscript.

OTHELLO

I believe this to be true of *Othello*. Here I can find nothing that points to F being printed from Q, and something against it. *Othello* was the latest of the Shakespearian quartos, having appeared in 1622. By then the printing of the folio was already in progress, though it had not yet reached the Tragedies. If Q was authorized the company presumably reserved the right of reprinting. It must have already appeared when the play was reached in the folio, and why it was not used as copy is not clear. The texts do not differ widely. Q is evidently cut: the few omissions in F are probably accidental. Occasional profanity in Q has been rather thoroughly eliminated in F. Chambers concludes that the copy for Q, if a stage manuscript, must antedate the Act of 1606 against profanity in plays. But we cannot consider the quarto of *Othello* apart from certain Beaumont and Fletcher plays that the King's men allowed to be printed between 1619 and 1623, plays that were written after the Act and appear unexpurgated in the quartos.¹ Clearly authors paid very little attention to the Act, whatever actors may have done. But it is not certain that either Q or F goes back to a stage copy—neither shows the stigmas of a prompt-book—and that F is expurgated is one of several indications that lead me to suspect that this purgation was in part at least the work of the folio editor rather than of the book-keeper. Chambers thinks that Q and F are independently derived from one original, a feature of which was the occasional writing of a line of verse as two separate half-lines—'perhaps for emphasis'. This division of lines—for reasons of typography, not emphasis—is a common habit of the folio compositors;² but here it occurs in the quarto likewise, sometimes at the same point sometimes not. But there is more to it than this; for in some cases we find accompanying mislineation in Q, where I have little doubt that the source of the trouble was a

¹ See K. W. Cameron, "'Othello', Quarto I, Reconsidered', *PMLA*, 1932, xlvii. 671.

² See *The Library*, 1936, xvii. 180-1; McKerrow, *Prolegomena*, 1939, pp. 47-9.

marginal addition or alteration in the original manuscript. My belief is that both Q and F go back fairly directly to foul papers, and rather confused and illegible ones at that. Misreadings in one or other text are frequent. How puzzling the writing and the alterations might be is shown by a passage where what was evidently a marginal addition appears in F (probably correctly) as 'She must change for youth', and in Q as 'she must have change, she must'; moreover Q places it at the end instead of the beginning of the sentence to which it belongs. Possibly Shakespeare had not made up his mind. For I do not think that all the differences of reading between Q and F can be due to error or misunderstanding. I suspect that some alternative readings were left undecided or imperfectly deleted in the foul papers. For instance when Othello embroiders on the theme 'Put out the light', the reading of Q, 'but once put out thine', and that of F, 'but once put out thy light', may both go back to Shakespeare's own hand. And so in part at least may the two versions of Emilia's subsequent speech:

Q: 'Twill out, 'twill! I hold my peace, sir? No!

I'll be, in speaking, liberal as the air . . .

F: 'Twill out, 'twill out! I, peace?

No, I will speak as liberal as the North . . .

If not, it will be difficult to avoid bringing in an element of reporting, and the texts are too good for that.

But I am not convinced that either Q or F was printed directly from the foul papers, though the cuts might of course have been indicated in these and observed by one compositor but not the other. The stage directions are normal for an author and have a common basis in the two texts.¹ Q adds some elucidations of the action: these would be adequate for the stage but show no marked characteristics of the prompter. In F the directions are fewer and generally briefer and would be rather inadequate for performance. Q has one massed entry (at 1. iii. 47, recalling those in the *The Merry Wives*) with duplication later: this is not in F. Q is the only early quarto divided into acts: F adds a division into scenes.

Both texts show signs of editing. An amusing instance of

¹ See appendix (p. 173).

what I take to be interference by the sophisticating editor of the folio occurs in the last act where Lodovico explains

that belike Iago in the nick
Came in and satisfied him.

The editor objected to the colloquial 'nick' and substituted 'interim'¹—and I am sorry to say that the Cambridge editors fell for it. A single page of Q (sig. C4) illustrates the editing on both sides. There is a line divided between two speakers that runs (correctly) in Q:

Due to the Moor, my lord.—God bu'y, I ha' done.

F ruins it by a pedantic expansion of the second half to 'God be with you: I have done'. A little later a patch of prose by the Duke marks the transition from moralizing to business, and this is led up to by one prose line appended by Brabantio to his sententious couplets:

I humbly beseech you proceed to th' affairs of state.

So F: but Q seeks to reduce it to verse in the form:

Beseech you now, to the affairs of the state.

I think it probable that Q was printed from a private transcript made from the foul papers with a fair amount of editing. There is no indication of playhouse use, the tinkering being literary rather than theatrical. In that case of course there is no knowing how the manuscript got into the publisher's hands. But in view of the protection extended in 1619 by the Lord Chamberlain to the King's men's plays we can hardly believe it was printed without their sanction.² Still, if the copy did not come from the playhouse, this may account for the folio editors' mistrust of the quarto text. F may possibly have been printed from the foul papers themselves, supposing them to have been a good deal edited subsequent to the assumed transcript; but perhaps, in spite of a few queer spellings that might be Shakespearian, it is more

¹ So in *Hamlet*, I. i. 65, 'jump at this dead hour' (Q1, 2), he substituted 'just' for 'jump'.

² See above, p. 44. It was entered on 6 Oct. 1621 under the hand of Sir George Buc, which I have argued makes it likely that the prompt copy was produced for inspection. There might however have been a special licence for printing.

probable that another transcript intervened. Again there is no indication that this was made for the theatre.

In 1630 a second quarto appeared. It was printed from Q₁, but with the omitted passages restored. Clark and Wright believed that these were derived, not from F, but from a manuscript, which would give them independent authority. Chambers doubts this—I think with reason, for it is clear that Q₂ did have recourse to F elsewhere. It is, namely, expurgated, and though the purgation is not as thorough as in F, where oaths are altered the alteration is almost always the same. For instance:

Q₁: O God! O heavenly God!

F, Q₂: O heaven! O heavenly powers!

Also in a passage already cited Q₂ like F reads 'interim' in place of 'nick'. It would be surprising therefore if Q₂ had drawn on a different source for the restorations. There are of course a few errors and variants. Presumably the passages were copied into the margins of a copy of Q₁, and not always correctly copied. The heavy punctuation and capitalization of F have disappeared; but even if the copyist preserved them the compositor would naturally tend to follow a uniform style. It would have been simpler, one would suppose, to have printed Q₂ directly from F: there may have been copyright objections.

TROILUS AND CRESSIDA

I suspect that the manuscripts used for *Troilus and Cressida* were of a somewhat similar character, though here F appears to have been actually set up from a corrected copy of Q. I think there can be no doubt of this. Besides common errors and unusual spellings there are several points where the arrangement in F can only be explained by peculiarities in Q that the latter is unlikely to have taken over from its copy. But if so, the example of Q used for F had been extensively altered from another source, since besides minor changes several short passages are added. The relation of the manuscripts behind Q and F is a particularly difficult problem. Revision has of course been suggested. But besides more general objections there is the difficulty of

deciding in which text revision is to be supposed. It is an assumption that I think the critic should avoid if possible.

The history of the play was probably unusual. It had been acted by the Chamberlain's men before 7 Feb. 1603, when Roberts made a provisional entrance. It was re-entered on 28 Jan. 1609 by Bonion and Walley and published by them the same year. In the original issue they asserted that it had been acted at the Globe, but they later cancelled this statement and called it 'a new play, never staled with the stage, never clapperclawed with the palms of the vulgar', and implied that it was published against the wishes of 'the grand possessors'—presumably the King's men. The probability is that by 'the stage' they meant the public stage, and that the play had been acted privately, perhaps at one of the Inns of Court—the epilogue at least can never have been intended for the royal court.¹

It seems likely that both Q and F go back to Shakespeare's foul papers. The most striking features that emerge from a comparison of the texts are the frequent synonymous variants, differences in number and tense, and small alterations of word order. These suggest reporting, but other indications are absent. Moreover we should apparently have to suppose that it was F that was the report, for its readings seem to be generally though not consistently inferior. (At least, that is how they strike me: Chambers I admit inclines to the opposite opinion.) I can only conclude, as Chambers does, that the differences are to be set down to editing and to errors of transcription and printing. But I think that the editing was made necessary by the state of the original manuscript. Many of the variants must be deliberate: so must some of the omissions, though others are doubtless accidental. These are more frequent and more extensive in

¹ See Peter Alexander in *The Library*, 1928, ix. 278. The licence by Segar as deputy for Buc, recorded in the entrance of 1609, cannot have been for the original performance, since Buc's patent as acting Master was not issued till 23 June 1603, some months after Roberts's entrance, and Segar is only heard of in 1608-9. This however does not prove that the prompt-book was submitted to Buc on the occasion of a revival: in view of the unauthorized nature of the publication, we may assume that his licence was for printing. Cf. p. 113, note.

Q; but both texts cut out some of Thersites's medical filth, though they do so at different points. The prologue is only found in F. Some of the cuts in Q remove obscurities and are accompanied by alterations in the surrounding text: they are pretty certainly attempts to tidy up passages that appeared unsatisfactory in the foul papers. In F there is a repetition of the lines:

Pandarus. But hear you, hear you!

Troilus. Hence, broker-lackey! ignomy and shame

Pursue thy life, and live aye with thy name!

They appear first at the end of v. iii. (with slight variations) and this seems to have been their original position, for they fittingly mark the disappearance of Pandarus from the play proper. But they are repeated at the very end to introduce his quite inappropriate reappearance on the battle-field to speak the epilogue. It was probably intended to move them, but they were not clearly enough deleted at the earlier point. Q has effected the change, and the lines appear only in their final position. Again the unmetrical introduction in F only of the words 'they call him Troilus' near the beginning as well as near the end of a speech by Ulysses in iv. v. can best be explained as due to an author's change of purpose in course of writing. It looks therefore as though Q had been cleaned up. Yet it cannot represent the prompt copy, for the stage directions are wholly inadequate: many entrances and exits are not marked at all.

I think the copy used for Q may have been a transcript made from the foul papers for some patron of the private performance. That would account for the presence of literary and the absence of theatrical editing.¹ There appear to be a few Shakespearian tricks of spelling and possibly of punctuation: these might survive in a transcript by a rather naive scribe. On the other hand, in a few instances the Q and F readings both have a Shakespearian flavour (as in

¹ It would also account for Buc's licence to print, since the allowed copy, bearing presumably Tilney's acting licence, would have been in the hands of the 'grand possessors', who objected to the publication (but cf. p. 114, note 3). This suggests that the entrance of *King Lear* under the hand of Sir George Buc may be open to the same explanation, namely a licence to print: cf. p. 96, note 3.

Othello): and if some of the variants are really thought to imply revision, we might conjecture that the transcript was made by Shakespeare himself. I am not disposed to rule out the possibility.¹ No doubt he would have introduced differences, some intentionally others unintentionally, in the process. He was perhaps capable of making actual errors and omissions; anyhow the printer was.

We have seen that F probably represents the foul papers pretty closely. It has all the directions of Q, often unaltered, but adds a large number of necessary entrances and exits as well as notes for noises and action. The common basis is doubtless authorial though there is nothing very distinctive. The additions in F suggest on the whole a playhouse origin, but they seem too casual to have come from a regular prompt-book.² Possibly there never was any formal prompt-book: for a private performance shift may have been made with foul papers roughly marked for the occasion.³ At the same time I find it difficult to believe that the original foul papers were sent to the printer. There is too much inferior phraseology to ascribe it to the folio editor. I rather fancy that a transcript must have been made by some one who knew, or thought he knew, the play well, and allowed himself to write on occasion what his memory or invention suggested rather than what was—perhaps not very legibly—before him. And it was from this transcript, I imagine, that the quarto was 'corrected' to serve as copy for the folio—on the whole perhaps rather unfortunately.

2 HENRY IV

The Second Part of *Henry IV* presents rather different features. Q (1600) omits passages amounting to some 170 lines that appear in F. Their absence sometimes leaves the sense defective, and they are therefore presumably cuts.

¹ In that case the duplications mentioned in the previous paragraph may never have stood in any manuscript, but be due to conflation of alternative versions in the course of preparing Q to serve as copy for F.

² See appendix (p. 174).

³ I have already suggested that this is what happened with *The Launching of the Mary* a quarter of a century later (see p. 33). Query: if the play was never publicly acted would it have needed licensing? Sir Edmund Chambers tells me that he thinks not.

There must have been a complete manuscript available for F, and it has generally been assumed that F was printed from it. Chambers is non-committal: he thinks Q and F may have been printed from the same manuscript (one observing the cuts and the other not) or that Q may have been used as copy for F (with the cuts restored) but finds no decisive evidence. There is indeed nothing conclusive, but several indications, including common errors, point to the use of Q.¹ The most significant is the assignment to Poins of a speech of Bardolph's (II. ii. 80-4). This might be a slip in Q: it can hardly have stood uncorrected in a playhouse manuscript. There is an interesting point in the first scene, where Lord Bardolph (of course a different character from the 'irregular humorist') has been substituted for Sir John Umfrevile, though not completely in either text. It would seem that lines 161-2 were originally assigned to Umfrevile, but that a corrector wrote Bardolph's name opposite them in the manuscript, with the result that Q gave the first to *Vmfr.* and the second to *Bard.* F, knowing that Umfrevile has no business here, omitted the first altogether.² (But see p. 182.)

There can be little doubt that Q was printed from foul papers on which the cuts had been marked. The spelling 'Scilens' (several times) is significant and is borne out by others of a possibly Shakespearian character. There are several indications of marginal revision. In I. ii. words are misplaced (corrected in F); in III. i three and a half lines (not in F) leave a short line in the text; in IV. i two single lines, one superfluous another nonsense, were removed from Q in the course of printing (they do not appear in F). This is not the only alteration that Q underwent. As originally printed the

¹ It should however be observed that in F there is a lavish use of parentheses that recalls the plays supposed to have been printed from manuscripts by Crane (see p. 141.) The peculiarity was noticed by Crompton Rhodes (*Shakespeare's First Folio*, p. 104). It is curious that it should survive in F if this was really printed from a corrected copy of Q. In this connexion it is interesting to find a tendency to massed entries in F. (Parentheses are also frequent in the folio text of *Othello*.)

² The lines are quite separate and indeed parallel. It might be suggested that the second was written to replace the first when the alteration in the characters was made, and that F correctly represents the intention of the reviser. The Cambridge editors (following Capell) assign the first line to Travers, but this is mere vamping. Pope gave both to Bardolph.

108 lines of III. i were omitted: they were later supplied by means of a cancel. Presumably a single leaf of manuscript was misplaced or mislaid, an accident more likely to happen to foul papers than to a carefully prepared copy.¹ The stage directions are clearly authorial, at once defective and redundant from the prompter's point of view, with many loose ends and picturesque touches.² Some irregularities and inconsistencies are doubtless due as Chambers supposes to 'changes of intention by the author during composition'. There are some indeterminate numbers and one interesting locality note, 'within the forest of Gaultree'. There is a massed entry to v. ii with duplication later. Two or three notes for noises have probably been added by the prompter. Chambers supposes the manuscript to have been a prompt-book on the ground of the appearance of an actor's name, Sincklo, as one of the Beadles in v. iv. I have already explained (p. 40) that this does not necessarily follow. In the case of such a minor character the inference indeed would usually be a natural one; but here the part was clearly written for a particular actor—Quickly calls him 'Thou anatomy'.³ We do not know that Sincklo was abnormally lean, but we do know that the company included a living skeleton, who played Pinch in *The Comedy of Errors* and the Apothecary in *Romeo and Juliet*.

I think that F certainly has behind it a playhouse manuscript. The directions have been drastically pruned, supplemented, made explicit, and generally tidied up for the stage. That the aim was theatrical rather than literary seems indi-

¹ Of course the printer might have turned over two leaves at once and so missed a couple of pages: but it is obviously more likely that a single scene would occupy a single leaf in foul papers than fill exactly one opening of a fair copy.

² See appendix (p. 174).

³ So F: 'atomy'; but this is merely an aphetic form surviving in modern dialect in the sense of skeleton, and distinct from the 'atomies' of *As you Like it*, III. ii. 245, and *Romeo and Juliet*, I. iv. 57 (O.E.D.). It would be tempting to suppose that Sincklo doubled the part of Beadle with that of Justice Shallow, whose 'dimensions to any thick sight were invisible' (III. ii. 336: see the whole description), were it not that the Beadle enters as Shallow leaves the stage. A warning to speculation! Sincklo is also named in 3 *Henry VI* (III. i. 1, as a Keeper), in the Introduction to *The Taming of the Shrew* (see p. 73, note 1), and in that to *The Malcontent* (1604), where he is in danger of being mistaken for a viol da gamba. See also p. 140, note; and for Sincklo's appearance, A. Gaw in *Anglia*, 1926, xlix. 289.

cated by an alteration in the last scene. Here Q brings the royal procession across the stage before Falstaff and his crew come on, and then a second time when they break in on it. F cuts out the first entry. This may have been done in preparing the prompt-book. Elsewhere the manuscript must of course have contained the full text, since F restores the cuts; but these may have been indicated. Small omissions in F are explicable in various ways. Profanity has been very thoroughly removed, and some indelicacy likewise. There are a good many verbal differences between Q and F, and errors (some of which look like misreadings) are found in both. F seems to have been rather freely edited; and this, in conjunction with transcription and composition, will I think account for all the observed divergence. Most of F's correction of Q might be conjectural, and the filling out of some short lines might be editorial; but since a manuscript was certainly available it is natural to suppose that it was used for the purpose.

TITUS ANDRONICUS

For two other plays the editors of the folio undoubtedly had recourse to manuscripts, *Titus Andronicus* and *Richard II.* *Titus* was printed in 1594. The stage directions in Q are descriptive and literary, very much what we should expect from an author not closely connected with the theatre.¹ Apart from misprints the text is good. There can be little doubt that it was printed from the author's copy, and there is evidence that this had undergone alteration. Some changes were probably made in proof. On sig. I2 in v. i the speakers' names are centred and leaded, apparently to make up for the removal of eight lines of text. Others are centred, without leading, in the opening speeches of the play; but here not more than four or five lines could have been removed, and it is possible that the printer had not yet decided what typographical style to adopt.² There are however other marks of alteration. If some erroneous lines were removed others

¹ See appendix (p. 176). There is some inconsistency in speech prefixes.

² The same year the same printer, John Danter, centred and leaded the speakers' names throughout the first sheet of *Orlando Furioso*.

were left standing. Three and a half lines (after 1. i. 35) tell how Titus has returned

and at this day
To the monument of that [*read the*] Andronici
Done sacrifice of expiation
And slain the noblest prisoner of the Goths.

But this forms the subject of the episode that immediately follows, which would therefore seem to be an addition to the original composition, or at least to the original design. The inference is borne out by the direction for the entry of 'Tamora, the Queen of Goths, and her two sons, Chiron and Demetrius', for it subsequently appears that she is also accompanied by her eldest son, Alarbas, who as the 'noblest prisoner' is led off to be sacrificed. There may likewise have been some transposition or telescoping of scenes: the transition at 1. i. 391 is so abrupt that it is difficult not to suspect that the speech of Marcus was designed to begin a new one. There was also probably a marginal addition to the Clown's part at iv. iii. 90-1. Whether these alterations imply later revision or merely changes in the course of composition there is nothing to show. I find no evidence of more than one hand. It is true that a few lines seem to stand out in merit from the rest, but though some are detachable others are woven into the texture of the play.¹

A second edition appeared in 1600, printed from a defective copy of Q1 with conjectural restoration of several passages in the text near the end. This accounts for the addition of four otiose lines to the last speech.² The beginning was also edited to the extent of omitting the inconsistent passage quoted above, though the defective stage direction was not altered. A third edition was printed from Q2 in 1611.

¹ The search for Ravenscroft's 'master touches' has proved rather futile. What strikes me as the best line in the play, 'There greet in silence, as the dead are wont', is not characteristically Shakespeare's. On the other hand the addition to the Clown's speech certainly has a Shakespearian flavour.

² The fullest account of the facts, detected independently by J. S. G. Bolton and R. B. McKerrow, is given by J. Q. Adams in his introduction (pp. 24-8) to the facsimile of the unique copy of Q1 now in the Folger Shakespeare Library at Washington (1936).

F was printed from Q₃ with the addition of one whole scene, III. ii. For this there must of course have been a manuscript, but it is not certain whether the scene formed part of the play as written or was a later addition. It runs to about 90 lines and might have filled a single leaf of foul papers. It was apparently there when the act division was introduced, but this is not original, for the second act has been made to begin in the middle of a scene, the direction being altered accordingly.¹ The scene differs appreciably from the rest in manner, and several critics have recognized this manner as later—an opinion with which I am disposed to agree.² There is nothing to indicate that the addition formed part of a complete manuscript.³

Apart from this there is little evidence for the use of a manuscript of the play. F does indeed contain one or two lines not in Q. They are rather pointless and therefore perhaps unlikely to be additions: at the same time there is nothing to show that they are original. Again, while the basis of the directions is the same as in Q, there are many alterations and additions of a prompt character, particularly 'Flourish' frequently, also 'Hautboys'. Textual variants are mostly misprints in one or other edition: a few may be accidental substitutions, a few possibly due to the folio editor. Speakers' names are on the whole more regular in F. A difficult speech in the last scene, which Q rather unconvincingly assigns to a 'Roman Lord', F transfers by desperate conjecture to a 'Goth'.⁴

If the additional lines and directions were supplied from a complete manuscript, this must have contained the

¹ Moreover the 'Flourish' that in F replaces the 'Sound trumpets' of Q appears erroneously at the head of Act II instead of at the end of Act I. This certainly shows that the division was marked in the copy used for F, but by whom it is impossible to say.

² Not a later Shakespearian manner, but one suggestive rather of the style of Webster. One naturally thinks of the additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* printed in 1602.

³ It may be significant that throughout the scene we find *An.* replacing *Titus* as a prefix, and also the spelling 'Tamira' for 'Tamora' the only time the name occurs. But this of course does not prove anything.

⁴ v. iii. 73. Capell certainly improved the passage greatly by omitting the prefix altogether (continuing the speech to Marcus) and reading 'Lest' for 'Let'. If he was right it goes to show that no manuscript was available for the correction of Q.

original text, and it is surely inconceivable that all these small alterations should have been made by comparison with it and no notice taken of the spurious passages substituted in Q2. The fact therefore that these remained untouched in F seems incompatible with the belief that any manuscript was available other than that for III. ii. Yet F contains directions that must have originated in the playhouse. The only conclusion seems to be that in this instance, owing presumably to the loss of the original prompt-book, a copy of one of the later quartos had been used and annotated in the theatre, and that this was at the disposal of the printer of F.¹

Q1 is therefore the authoritative text. As for F, apart from the one scene of doubtful authorship that it supplies, its chief interest is that it shows us the stage arrangements current at a comparatively late date.

RICHARD II

In contrast to *Titus* the first quarto of *Richard II*, 1597, has author's directions 'of the short type, which now becomes normal in Shakespeare's plays', as Chambers significantly remarks.² It was most likely printed from the author's manuscript, a conclusion supported, Pollard thinks, by a study of the punctuation.³ Chambers notes a speech by York (II. ii. 98-122) that needs tidying up: in this the faulty metre seems partly due to a couple of errors which were corrected in F though the rest was reproduced as it stood.

In 1608 the fourth quarto for the first time printed the passage in IV. i dealing with Richard's abdication. This is evidently original and had been omitted from Q1 on political grounds. The lines immediately following were doctored to cover the cut, but this still left the Abbot's words,

A woeful pageant have we here beheld

in the air. The copy for this scene as printed in Q4 was a report. It is not unlike the 1608 *Lear* in textual features,

¹ F was, as I have said, printed from Q3, but if it was Q2 that was used by the prompter, his notes may have been transcribed into a copy of Q3 for use at press.

² See appendix (p. 177).

³ *A New Shakespeare Quarto: The Tragedy of King Richard II, printed the third time, 1598* (facsimile with introduction), 1916, pp. 64-5.

and may have been obtained by shorthand. Some perversions and possibly omissions may be due to the actors, the consequent mislining to the reporter or compositor.

F was printed either from Q3 (1598^b) or from Q5 (1615)—it is not certain which. But a better text of the abdication episode was supplied from a playhouse manuscript, in accordance with which the directions were also modified and supplemented, so that they bear little resemblance to those of Q. There are some cuts totalling about fifty lines. They lighten long passages and perhaps remove obscurities, but one or two are rather clumsy. Four single-line omissions might be accidental: one leaves a rime widowed, but the others are perhaps more likely deliberate. The only line added is pretty clearly a prompter's addition based on a stage direction in Q. Most of the variants seem due to misprints, the correction of obvious errors, subconscious substitution, and tinkering by the folio editor; but a few were probably imported from the manuscript and may be due either to the copyist or the book-keeper. This would of course account for the substitution of 'Heaven' for 'God' if there was a Jacobean revival, which is uncertain; but, as I have already remarked, I suspect that this became a habit with the editor. In any case the collation with the manuscript must have been rather perfunctory seeing that F retained fifty per cent of the errors that had accumulated in reprinting Qq 2 and 3, to say nothing of the presumable errors of Q1. I see no reason to suppose with Pollard (to whom the investigation of the text is mainly due) that a copy of Q3 or Q5 had been collated with Q1 and used as a prompt-book: an independent manuscript is much more likely.

MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING

In none of the five plays that remain for consideration was any part of the folio text actually set up from a manuscript: nevertheless in three out of the five there is evidence that a playhouse manuscript existed and was consulted. These are all plays of 1600, *Much Ado about Nothing*, *The Merchant of Venice*, and *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*.

At one point in the quarto of *Much Ado* the names of the

actors Kemp and Cowley appear as prefixes for Dogberry and Verges, whence it has been assumed that the text was set up from a prompt copy. But Shakespeare must obviously have written the parts with particular actors in mind, and nothing is more likely than that he should have used their names.¹ Everything points to the copy having been foul papers that lacked final revision. The stage directions are obviously the author's, casual and often inadequate,² and there is much inconsistency in designating the speakers. Dover Wilson agrees that the 'anomalies can hardly derive from anyone but the author and most of them would certainly have been cleaned up in a theatrical fair-copy'. But when he adds that 'therefore' Q is 'a text printed directly from the prompt-book just as Shakespeare left it', he is contradicting himself. A prompt-book is essentially a theatrical fair copy, whether written by the author or by a scribe, and in it ambiguities would necessarily be cleared up.

F was printed from Q with little alteration. The actors' prefixes remain. At one point the substitution of the name of a singer, Jack Wilson, for the direction 'Music' reveals the book-keeper's hand. One passage playing on 'God' and one hit at German and Spanish fashions have been deleted. There has been what Chambers calls 'an inadequate and sometimes incorrect revision of stage-directions and speech-prefixes'. He concludes that 'The example [of Q] followed must have been used as, or corrected by, a prompt-copy'. But the same reasons that forbid our supposing that Q was printed from a prompt copy make it unlikely that it was used as such. Drastic correction would have been needed to fit it for the stage. A prompt-book however there must have been—the play was revived in 1612–13 and held the stage

¹ There is a good deal of confusion. In iv. ii Dogberry is first *Keeper*, then *Andrew*, before settling down to *Kemp*, *Kem.*, or *Ke.*: once he is *Constable*. Verges is *Cowley* or *Cowley*, but once *Const.* The *Keeper* I take to be a misprint for *Kempe* (F once wrongly expands *Ke.* to *Kee.*): *Andrew* is supposed to stand for 'Merry-Andrew', i.e. Clown (though this is not recorded earlier than Dryden). One speech by Conrade is given to *Cowley*, evidently through a misreading of the prefix *Con.* In iii. v. Dogberry is *Const. Dog.* but Verges *Headb(orough)*. In v. i. they are merely *Const.* and *Con.* 2. Only in iii. iii are their names consistent. It is evident that Shakespeare was not very certain of them, but that is no evidence of revision.

² See appendix (p. 178).

folio apparently without reference to any manuscript, namely *Love's Labour's Lost* and 1 *Henry IV*, both of 1598. The former therefore presents an exact parallel to *Romeo and Juliet* if, as seems likely, the 'good' quarto was printed to replace a 'bad' one now lost. Q contains various indications of author's copy and was I think clearly printed from foul papers. The directions are consistent with this view.¹ There are admittedly duplicate passages in the text that are clearly alternative and should not both have been allowed to stand, and there are also discrepancies in the relation of the characters. Chambers tentatively follows the suggestion of a Danish scholar, Miss Greta Hjort,² to the effect that confusion may have resulted from an attempt to use the lost 'bad' quarto for copy, as in *Romeo and Juliet*. But as concerns the duplications it should be observed that nothing similar resulted in the relevant portion of that play, and that both alternatives appear to be perfectly good text. I also think they are more likely to have come about through changes of intention in the course of writing than through revision of the kind Dover Wilson surmises and Chambers doubts. Wilson draws attention to the appearance in some parts of elaborate care in typographical distinctions and even the use of type ornaments, and their complete absence in others. He infers that a carefully and rather ornamentally written manuscript had been largely worked over by a hand that made no distinction of script. This seems to me fanciful. The facts, if they require any explanation beyond varying care in the printing house, could equally be accounted for by partial use of the 'bad' quarto. Lace ornaments appear in the *Romeo and Juliet* of 1597, and a type ornament is prefixed to a direction in *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, 1600. Chambers traverses Wilson's deductions from confusion and inconsistency in the speech prefixes. I do not think that there is anything that cannot be explained by the natural looseness of the author's practice as observed by McKerrow, by alterations in the course of writing, and by some blunders

¹ See appendix (p. 180). At v. ii. 678 a few words of text appear as a direction.

² 'The Good and Bad Quartos of "Romeo" and Juliet' and "Love's Labour's Lost"', *Modern Language Review*, 1926, xxi. 140.

of the compositor. Wilson gives an attractive explanation of the confusion between the masked ladies in the second act; but the only revision it implies might have been part of the original composition of the play.

F was printed from Q with very little alteration. Some attempt was made to normalize the prefixes. Wilson supposes that the copy used had served as a prompt-book. This is surely inconceivable: there would have had to be far more tidying up of speakers' names, duplications must have been removed, and the ladies reduced to order. Nor can any material use have been made of the playhouse 'book', which must presumably have existed since the piece was revived in 1605 and continued to hold the stage. There is indeed nothing whatever to connect F with the playhouse or to suggest that the few alterations it contains were anything but editorial.¹ The direction 'Song' at the head of Act III is an obvious inference from the text. The modification at the end is a desperate attempt to make sense of the quarto subscription, 'The words of Mercury are harsh after the songs of Apollo',² which Chambers remarks 'looks like the beginning of an epilogue or of a presenter's speech for a following mask'.

I HENRY IV


Of what was presumably the first edition of 1 *Henry IV* only a single sheet (sig. C) survives.³ It preserves one word omitted in that usually reckoned as Q1: 'How the *fat* rogue roared' (II. ii. 118). Q has normal author's directions⁴ and may go back to his manuscript, though other evidence is slight. A few textual confusions might come from foul copy: for instance in the first scene (l. 76) the words 'In faith it is' printed after a space at the end of one speech should properly

¹ There is a note 'Finis Actus Primus', but the reason for the addition seems to be typographical (cf. p. 145, note 1).

² Printed in large type below the final song. In its place F has:

Brag. The words of Mercury
Are harsh after the songs of Apollo:
You that way; we this way.

Exeunt omnes.

 In the Folger Shakespeare Library at Washington.
See appendix (p. 180).

begin the next. The stage directions needed to mark the break between what became Acts III and IV are absent. If the source was a playhouse transcript it preserved the original directions with unexpected fidelity.

F was printed from Q5, 1613 (Q6, 1622, had probably not yet appeared when F was set up). The stage directions have been slightly edited, but in a literary rather than a theatrical sense. The apparent massing of entries for the second scene may be due merely to careless editing. The omission of a direction in v. iv may be accidental, that of two lines in the next scene due to the second being unintelligible. A division into acts and scenes is introduced, and the necessary directions between Acts III and IV supplied. Occasionally F returns to a reading of Q1 that later quartos had corrupted, but nowhere does the correction appear beyond reasonable conjecture. There is no evidence whatever of the use of a playhouse manuscript or of a copy of the quarto that had served as a prompt-book. The fact therefore that profanity has been very thoroughly removed once again suggests that this was sometimes at least done by the editor.

We have found that all twelve quartos that can without qualification be classed as 'good'¹ were probably printed from Shakespeare's own manuscripts or foul papers, or at least from manuscripts immediately derived from them. The qualification recognizes that the intervention of a private transcript is likely in *Othello* and *Troilus*, and that of a close playhouse transcript possible in *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* and 1 *Henry IV*.

In only two cases out of the twelve, *Hamlet* and *Othello*, was the folio set up from manuscript. In three cases, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, and 1 *Henry IV*, a quarto was reprinted without reference to any other source. In the remaining seven, manuscripts were available and were used to a greater or less extent to correct or supplement the texts of the quartos. Those of *Troilus* and 2 *Henry IV* underwent considerable alteration: in *Titus* the manuscript provided the

¹ Namely the ten considered in this lecture together with *Romeo and Juliet*, 1599, and *Hamlet*, 1604-5.

text of a new scene, in *Richard II* an improved text of the abdication; in *Much Ado*, *The Merchant of Venice*, and *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* it served only to supply a few directions and possibly corrections in the text. It is natural that the character of these hypothetical manuscripts should at times be difficult to determine. Those underlying the folio texts of *Othello* and *Troilus* appear to have been (non-theatrical) transcripts of foul papers, of the same general type as those from which the quartos were printed. The manuscript used for *Titus* may have contained no more than a single scene and have been inserted in a copy of a quarto used as a prompt-book. In the other seven plays the manuscript was presumably the prompt-book itself.

It will be observed that the methods pursued by the folio editors were far from consistent, and the use they made of the playhouse material intermittent. But they do appear to have had some critical conscience and to have followed its rather obscure promptings. We may conjecture that where they knew that the manuscripts at their disposal differed considerably from the printed copies they endeavoured to substitute what they imagined to be the better text. When they were unaware of such differences they probably troubled little about minor variations; but it should be counted to their credit that even so they appear to have generally handed over what material they possessed, and if insufficient or injudicious use was made of it the fault may have been rather in Jaggard's office than at the Globe. No doubt the editorial work on the folio fell deplorably short of the standard we should have liked to see attained, but it was of a very different order from anything we find in other collections of a comparable sort,¹ and the amount of care and even of intelligence devoted to the task remains a striking tribute to the esteem in which Shakespeare's plays were held.

¹ For example, at a somewhat later date, in Sir Kenelm Digby's edition of Jonson's posthumous works, 1641.

VI. THE FIRST FOLIO

THE folio of 1623 was not the first attempt at a collection of Shakespeare's plays. That was made four years earlier, and though not a very reputable affair is at least evidence of the interest taken in his works. It deserves to be remembered as an enterprising if rather impudent venture, and as having perhaps afforded an incentive to the more ambitious and authoritative undertaking.¹

The hazardous publisher was one Thomas Pavier, who employed William Jaggard to print for him.² The collection, which was in quarto, began with reprints of *The First Part of the Contention* and *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York* (i.e. 2 and 3 *Henry VI*) under the joint title of *The Whole Contention between Lancaster and York* followed by *Pericles*, with continuous signatures and two title-pages, of which the second bore the date 1619. It may have been intended to prefix a general title to the collection. But after these three plays had been printed—all be it noticed from 'bad' quartos—the continuous signatures were abandoned. Two more plays were printed with title-pages dated 1619, namely *A Yorkshire Tragedy* (which Pavier had already issued with a fraudulent ascription to Shakespeare in 1608) and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, another 'bad' quarto.³ But apparently something happened to make the enterprise risky, for the remaining five plays were printed with false dates, presumably with the intention of passing them off as belonging to the original editions. They included the 'good'

¹ The folio was advertised by anticipation in a catalogue of the Frankfort book-fair in October 1622 (F. P. Wilson in *T.L.S.*, 5 Nov. 1925) and printing had probably reached the Histories before the end of 1621 (E. E. Willoughby, *The Printing of the First Folio*, Bibliographical Society, 1932, chap. 3). Chambers (*William Shakespeare*, ii. 78) remarks that the actor list in the folio seems to belong to 1621. It would seem that the work was put in hand soon after the venture of 1619 had pointed the way.

² Concerning Pavier's collection see an article 'On Certain False Dates in Shakespearean Quartos', *The Library*, 1908, ix. 113, and W. J. Neidig, 'The Shakespeare Quartos of 1619', *Modern Philology*, 1910, viii. 145, besides the standard works of Pollard and Chambers; and for a speculative history of the venture, *Studies in the First Folio*, Shakespeare Association, 1924, pp. 139-44.

³ *The Merry Wives* was actually printed after *The Merchant of Venice*, and the reversion to the true date was probably an oversight.

quartos of *The Merchant of Venice* and *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* (each preserving the date of the first edition, 1600), the 'doubtful' quarto of *King Lear* (again preserving the original date, 1608), the 'bad' quarto of *Henry V* (from the original edition of 1600, but dated 1608, the date of *Lear* having been accidentally left standing in the imprint), and *Sir John Oldcastle*, a play by Drayton and others (reprinted, including the date, from the quarto of 1600, and now falsely attributed to Shakespeare¹).

There can be little doubt that what caused the change of plan was a letter of 3 May 1619 from the Lord Chamberlain to the Stationers' Company bidding them 'to take order for the stay of any further impression of any of the plays or interludes of His Majesty's servants without their consents'.² It is not however the history of this essentially piratical venture that concerns us here, but rather its editorial implications. For it is clear that some attempt was made to edit the texts in question, though whether this was part of a deliberate plan or whether certain copies containing manuscript corrections happened to come into the printer's hands it is difficult to say.³ What is certain is that some of the texts in this collection occasionally anticipate corrections made in, or at least readings of, the folio of 1623, though they contain many more alterations that diverge from that authority. The only play of which the folio text was set up from a 1619 quarto is *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, and in this it is of course natural to find that peculiar readings survive. Elsewhere there may be some resemblance of spelling and typographic usage due to both collections having been printed within four years at Jaggard's office.

The most extensive revision is found in *The Whole Contention*, and the most notable instance in the account of the

¹ By confusion (whether deliberate or accidental it is impossible to be certain, though not perhaps to guess) with *Henry IV*, which was of course popularly known by that title, Oldcastle having been the original name of the fat knight.

² Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, i. 136; Variorum 1821, iii. 160. The relevance of the document was pointed out by Crompton Rhodes, *Shakespeare's First Folio*, pp. 44-5. The quotation is actually from a repetition of 1637.

³ The likelihood of an accidental assemblage of corrected copies seems small: at the same time solicitude for the text is curiously at variance with the apparent indifference to the question of authenticity.

Duke of York's claim to the crown. This however stands apart from the rest. It was evidently realized that in Q1 the argument was absurd and that to make it intelligible it was necessary to recast it. This the reviser did, either from his own knowledge of history or with perfunctory reference to the chronicles. He naturally made some approach to the true version (as in F, 2 *Henry VI*, II. ii) in matter, though not in language. Indeed he altered two lines that were substantially correct and that reappear in F. Elsewhere verbal alterations in both parts are frequent, and a minority (about 30 in each part) anticipate the readings of F. Most of these appear to be chance coincidences arising through obvious emendation, normalization, and the like. But four substantial changes of a line or more in the First Part and one in the Second Part were probably derived from recollection of a performance. In these the text approximates to that of F, while it shows internal signs of reporting.¹

In none of the other plays are the agreements with F so numerous or important. In *Henry V* there are perhaps a dozen that attract notice, but only two are really significant.² They may again be recollections of a performance. In *The Merchant of Venice*, which seems to have been very carefully revised, there are besides trivial corrections and normalizations perhaps four or five of rather more significance, and these include some curious common errors.³ The coinci-

¹ The variants are conveniently collected in Furnivall's introductions to the Praetorius facsimiles of the two parts of *The Whole Contention* (1886), and also of the Hayes quarto of *The Merchant of Venice* (1887).

² IV. iii. 64-7: And gentlemen in England now abed

Shall think themselves accursed they were not here,
And hold their manhoods cheap whiles any speaks
That fought with us upon Saint Crispin's day.

The words 'they were not here' are absent from Q1: Q2 supplies 'They were not there'; on the other hand it omits 'And hold their manhoods cheap', which is in Q1. At IV. vii. 94 Q1 has 'Cryspin, Cryspin', Q2 'Crispin, Crispianus', F 'Crispin Crispianus'.

³ III. v. 24, Q1 'in', Q2 F 'e'ne'; IV. i. 100, Q1 'as', Q2 'tis', F 'tis' (both corrections); II. viii. 39, Q1 'Slumber', Q2 F 'Slubber' (possibly a correction); III. i. 7, Q1 'gossip report', Q2 F 'gossips report'; V. i. 65, Q1 'it in', Q2 F 'in it' (both errors). (At IV. i. 402 Furnivall's list is incorrect.) To account for these agreements I once suggested that Q2 and F were printed from the same (corrected) copy of Q1 (see ed. Dover Wilson, p. 176, note). It was not in any case a very happy suggestion, and Dr. Alice Walker has pointed out to me that it is in fact inadmissible.

dences may nevertheless I think be accidental. In *Lear* out of a list of two dozen I can only find four of any significance, and these are again well within the bounds of coincidence.¹ In *The Merry Wives* and *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* the variants in the 1619 quartos are fewer and in no way remarkable.²

The importance of the alterations in the 1619 quartos and the extent to which they anticipate the readings of the folio have perhaps been exaggerated. There are always many more that diverge from the folio reading than there are that approach it, and none have any authority from the editorial point of view.³ What is interesting and possibly significant is the fact that even in this earliest and abortive collection of Shakespeare's plays some attempt was made to edit the text.

There is one matter that calls for discussion at this point, since it concerns the copy used for the folio of 1623. A theory has been advanced, mainly by Crompton Rhodes and Dover Wilson,⁴ to the effect that in certain instances the plays in the folio were printed from what they call 'assembled' texts. It is suggested that at some time some of the prompt-books were lost or destroyed, and that, presumably in the absence of any foul papers, fresh manuscript copies of these plays were prepared by transcribing the actors' parts into a

¹ See M. Doran, *The Text of 'King Lear'*, pp. 112-13. The most interesting is the common substitution in Q2 and F of 'stop' for Q1 'stopple' at v. iii. 155 in a passage that presents difficult textual problems.

² Three plays of the 1619 collection were not included in the folio of 1623. Of *Pericles* the Cambridge editors report that 'With the average number of misprints, it presents many corrections of the text, sometimes certain and generally happy, but all probably conjectural'. *A Yorkshire Tragedy* was reprinted with little alteration. The case of *Sir John Oldcastle* is curious. It appears to have undergone considerable revision, apparently literary, including alteration of many stage directions; but the changes seem often pointless. Some oaths have been removed, but this may be accidental, for others remain. There are a good many careless omissions of single lines. The relation of the two quartos might repay study.

³ Unless, as is theoretically possible, *Lear* was printed from a copy of Q1 in which one or more sheets were in a corrected state of which no example is now known. But the evidence in favour of such an hypothesis is negligible.

⁴ Rhodes, *Shakespeare's First Folio*, 1923, pp. 96 ff.; Wilson, 'The Task of Heminge and Condell', in *Studies in the First Folio*, Shakespeare Association, 1924, pp. 72 ff.

consecutive text.¹ There is evidence from the eighteenth century that a surreptitious edition of a play by Sheridan partly originated in this manner,² and it may be freely admitted that the operation is a perfectly feasible one. But there are objections to supposing that it was ever resorted to in Shakespeare's plays that have been clearly formulated by Chambers.³ The method, at least in scenes between several characters, would have been exceedingly cumbersome and laborious, and even with the help of a plot would have needed great care and patience if any tolerable result was to be achieved. It is very difficult to imagine the scribe of an Elizabethan theatre accomplishing the task without leaving unmistakable evidence of the process. There is the further difficulty that the parts and the plot would most likely be kept together with the prompt-book,⁴ whereas the foul papers, if any, would probably be stored elsewhere; so that in the case of a fire, if that is what the advocates of the theory have in mind, it is unlikely that both the prompt-book and the foul papers would perish and the actors' parts and the plot survive. I may add that there is no record of any prompt-books having been lost in the fire at the Globe in 1613, and no reason to suppose that there were.⁵ We do know however that some of the 'books' of the King's company had gone astray ten or twelve years later. That of *Bonduca* was mislaid but eventually recovered; a new one of *The Honest Man's Fortune* was submitted for licence on 8 Feb. 1625. Of the former a fresh copy was made from foul papers; the new 'book' of the latter was more likely a revised transcript of a worn-out original.⁶ Herbert also licensed a fresh copy of

¹ According to Crompton Rhodes it was 'a simple process of scissors and paste'.

² See p. 60.

³ *William Shakespeare*, i. 153-5.

⁴ See p. 34.

⁵ Sir Henry Wotton writing within a week of the fire reported: 'This was the fatal period of that virtuous fabric, wherein yet nothing did perish but wood and straw, and a few forsaken cloaks' (Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, ii. 420). On the other hand, of the fire at the Fortune in 1621 John Chamberlain reported, also within a week: 'It was quite burnt down in two hours, and all their apparel and play-books lost' (*ibid.* ii. 442).

⁶ Herbert reallocated it, 'the original being lost' according to his informant, Joseph Taylor, but there is some ground for doubting this: see R. C. Bald, *Bibliographical Studies in the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1647*, Bibliographical Society, 1938, pp. 56-7. In the folio the play (which dated from 1613 and had once belonged to the Lady Elizabeth's men) was printed from a manuscript other than the one

The Winter's Tale on 19 Aug. 1623 because 'the allowed book was missing'. This is one of the plays to which the theory of assembling has been applied.

The theory revives one of Dr. Johnson's fantasies concerning playhouse manuscripts, but its modern exponents naturally do not put it forward without some textual evidence. This they find mainly in three plays, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (folio version), and *The Winter's Tale*. The details vary to some extent in each, but generally the distinguishing features are that the names of all the characters in a scene are massed together at the beginning irrespective of when they properly appear, that no subsequent entries are marked and no exits except at the end, and that there is a more or less complete absence of other directions. The idea is that the assembler first copied down the names of all the characters in the scene from the plot, and then constructed the text by piecing together the several parts. But a plot of course carefully distinguishes those characters which enter at the beginning from others that enter 'to them' in order, and also, if less consistently, indicates successive exits; and any scribe prepared to take the necessary care and trouble to sort out and arrange the various speeches, would have little difficulty in ascertaining and indicating the several entrances and exits. I may also remark that an actor's part might be expected to include the stage directions necessary to its rendering, and that the only example that survives is duly furnished with them. It is therefore not clear to me that the process supposed would have been likely to lead to the observed results, while other evidence adduced in support of the theory is trifling.

I think we must look elsewhere for an explanation of the peculiar features of these plays. Such massing of entrances is not altogether unknown in authors' manuscripts. Intending a scene between a certain set of characters, the writer may set down their names at the head of it, and then in fact begin say with a soliloquy by one of them before the rest make their appearance.¹ An instance of the sort is to be

Herbert licensed. This is extant and is in the same hand as *Bonduca*. It shows no sign of having been 'assembled'.

¹ As in *Pericles*, Q1, I. ii. 1, 34.

found at the beginning of Massinger's *Believe as you List*, which opens with a long dialogue between Antiochus and a Stoic before the other characters mentioned in the heading enter.¹ I have noted several in the plays of Shakespeare that we have already examined.² These are of course sporadic; but they indicate a tendency that a scribe might systematize under the influence of the neo-classical drama of the Continent. In this the convention was to mark a new scene whenever there was a change in the major characters on the stage—not as in the English drama only when the stage was empty—and each scene was therefore headed simply by a list of the characters present. Now, the foreign convention was adopted by Ben Jonson; and since the folio of his plays published in 1616 was the first important collection of the works of an English dramatist, it would naturally be looked to for a model, especially by a scribe or editor working with a literary rather than a theatrical end in view. Of course such a blending of two distinct conventions would be quite unreasonable, but we find an actual instance in the work of Ralph Crane, whom I have already had occasion to mention as a very accomplished scribe who is known to have worked for the King's company shortly after Shakespeare's death. He has left us a manuscript of Middleton's *Game at Chess* (written apparently for the author to present to a friend) in which this hybrid form is observed throughout.³ My own conjecture therefore is that the plays that exhibit this peculiarity were printed from literary transcripts made either by Crane himself or by some

¹ Owing to the loss of the second leaf of the manuscript we do not know whether the subsequent entry of these characters was separately marked or not.

² Perhaps the best example is that in 2 *Henry IV*, v. ii, where Q (undoubtedly printed from the author's manuscript) has the initial direction, 'Enter Warwick, Duke Humphrey, L. Chief Justice, Thomas Clarence, Prince John, Westmorland', and after eight short speeches between Warwick and the Chief Justice repeats 'Enter John, Thomas, and Humphrey'. This is corrected in F, which however on its side introduces several minor examples.

³ See ed. R. C. Bald, p. 29. It is true that since this manuscript contains a shortened text of the play (which he thinks may have been prepared for private performance) Dover Wilson has argued (reviewing Bald in *The Library*, 1930, xi. 113) that this is again an assembled text. But for various reasons (set out by Bald in reply, *ibid.*, 1931, xii. 243) this seems very unlikely. Webster's *Duchess of Malfy*, 1623, shows similar features. Both plays belonged to the King's men.

other professional scribe who shared his rather perverse habits.¹

We have of course already considered a good many, indeed rather over half, of the folio texts, and I will briefly recapitulate the results. Out of fourteen 'good' quartos twelve were used as copy for the folio, though in only three cases was no apparent reference made to a manuscript in so doing. *Troilus and Cressida* and 2 *Henry IV*, as well as *Richard III* and *King Lear* (which we decided should rather be called 'doubtful' quartos), were thoroughly revised; particular passages in *Titus Andronicus* and *Richard II* were supplied from another source; in *Much Ado about Nothing*, *The Merchant of Venice*, and *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, the use of a manuscript is less evident but still probable. *Love's Labour's Lost*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and 1 *Henry IV* were reprinted without alteration. *Hamlet* and *Othello*, on the other hand, were printed throughout from manuscript: the first from a transcript of the prompt-book, the second from a literary copy made from the foul papers. Of the 'bad' quartos no use was made in printing the folio, except perhaps now and then for reference, most notably in 2 *Henry VI*. Here we have five plays: in 2 and 3 *Henry VI* and *The Taming of the Shrew* the manuscript used for the folio was probably an early author's fair copy that had been rather imperfectly edited for the stage and had suffered some subsequent damage; in *Henry V* foul papers; in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* probably a transcript of a rather confused original, possibly again foul papers. There remain for consideration seventeen plays (since we have already dealt with *The Shrew*) that were printed in the folio for the first time. It will I think be convenient to take them in the order of their composition.

I HENRY VI

Most critics are agreed in finding more than one hand in the First Part of *Henry VI*: there is less agreement on what,

¹ This was also McKerrow's view, see *R.E.S.*, 1935, xi. 464. As we shall see (p. 141), there are independent grounds for believing that some of the plays in the folio may have been printed from manuscripts written by Crane.

if any, is Shakespeare's. Chambers remarks that in this instance the authority of the folio counts for little, since by 1623 the piece had evidently come to be regarded as an integral part of the trilogy. He himself allows Shakespeare only two scenes. Most likely the play was originally an independent piece, and was altered to form an introduction to the *Contention* plays (parts 2 and 3).¹ The act division is very irregular: it may have survived from the original, or at least from an earlier, form of the play, and have been upset by later revision.² I think the marking of the acts must point to prompt copy of some sort. Many directions are elaborate and descriptive; most noticeably so in the first two acts, but 'Enter in skirmish with bloody pates' is a nice example from the third, and the closely following 'Begin again' also suggests the author. Several (not entries) begin with 'Here': this has an archaic appearance and may be a personal peculiarity, but we find it again in some of Shakespeare's latest plays.³ Instances are confined to the first act, except for one in the third, 'Here sound an English march', which might be the prompter's if 'English march' had a technical sense.⁴ As in other early plays we seem to have an authorial manuscript used with little modification as a prompt copy. Either composite authorship or revision would explain certain contradictions and inconsistencies in the text. Whether the copy itself was 'heterogeneous' is uncertain, but had the whole been transcribed for a tidy prompt-book we might have expected the act divisions at least to have been either regularized or eliminated (there are none in parts 2 and 3). Of course we do not know that such a copy was not made and kept for the theatre. But we seem to come nearer to Wilson's 'continuous copy' in this than in any other play.

¹ It is possible however that the want of cohesion, suggestive as it is of alteration, may in fact be mostly the result of collaboration.

² Only the third and fourth acts are divided into scenes, the latter very imperfectly. The very short fifth act consists of one scene only (v. v of modern editions) containing 108 lines.

³ Namely *Coriolanus* and *The Winter's Tale*. It is also found once or twice in 1 *Henry IV* and *King John* and elsewhere. 'Here' occurs regularly before entrances and 'Then' before directions for action in *Arden of Feversham*, 1592.

⁴ Perhaps it had, for a 'Danish march' is among the directions peculiar to F in *Hamlet* (III. ii. 97). This however was probably a Jacobean addition.

THE COMEDY OF ERRORS

In *The Comedy of Errors* the remarkable directions 'from the Courtezan's', 'from the Bay', 'to the Priory', 'to the Abbess' point clearly to a set stage with three houses and entrances between. The play cannot therefore have been written for the public theatre, and in fact the earliest recorded performance was on 28 Dec. 1594 at Gray's Inn. I think there can be no doubt that the copy was an author's manuscript. The erratic speech prefixes point on McKerrow's theory direct to the act of composition, and their occasional abbreviation would account for certain anomalies. This view is borne out by the directions, though they are neither very full nor very distinctive: 'Enter . . . a schoolmaster called Pinch',¹ 'All gather to see them', 'Manet the two Dromios and two Brothers', look like the author's. But the prompter's hand appears as well. 'Run all out. Exeunt omnes, as fast as may be, frightened' I think shows the book-keeper adding a marginal 'Exeunt omnes' (incorrectly) to the author's original direction, not the other way about as Dover Wilson supposes. Such notes might easily have been added on the foul papers, and in a carefully prepared prompt-book the abnormalities of the prefixes would presumably have been cleared away. The absence of Shakespearian spellings cannot disprove autograph copy. But the text is generally clean, and at this early date it is particularly dangerous to dogmatize. Perhaps a tolerably careful author's copy may have been made to serve on the stage with a minimum of editing. The division into acts may have been the work of the folio editor, for as Chambers points out the direction 'Enter Antipholus and Dromio again' near the beginning

¹ There is nothing in the text to suggest that he was a schoolmaster. He was a 'conjurer', that is an exorcist, or at least a cleric who dabbled in exorcism. The insistence on his name and appearance (iv. iv. 50, v. i. 237 ff.) as well as on his profession seems to me quite pointless unless the audience were meant to recognize an actual person. He was

a hungry, lean-faced villain,
A mere anatomy, a mountebank,
A threadbare juggler and a fortune-teller,
A needy, hollow-eyed, sharp-looking wretch,
A living dead man.

Was this another of Sincklo's impersonations? Cf. p. 116, note 3.

of Act V after their exit at the end of Act IV shows that no division was originally contemplated at this point: but it might of course have been introduced by the book-keeper. I cannot believe with Dover Wilson in a prompt-book of which the text was written by one scribe and the directions by another, or in the cumbersome method of dictation from actors' parts. Nor can I see any sufficient ground for such fantasies: actors' parts would at least yield consistent prefixes.

THE TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA

In *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* there are no directions whatever beyond bare entrances and exits; moreover the latter occur seldom except at the end of scenes, and the former exclusively at the beginning, where the names of all the characters appearing in the course of the scene are massed together, usually in the order of their entrance. These features are the same as in *The Merry Wives*, and they have been supposed to indicate assembling from actors' parts. But, as Professor Bald has pertinently observed, they are also found in a transcript of *A Game at Chess* made in 1624 by Ralph Crane.¹ It can hardly therefore be without significance that certain graphic peculiarities of Crane's work, particularly his lavish use of parentheses, are found by Dover Wilson to be characteristic both of the present play and of *The Merry Wives*, and that they are also found in *The Tempest* and *Measure for Measure*—that is, in the four plays with which the folio opens.² There seems very little doubt that all these were printed from transcripts by Crane. This looks as though copies had been made for the occasion, but whether in the present instance from foul papers or from a prompt-book is less clear. A 'Finis' at the end of Act I must stand for 'Finis actus primus', whence it would seem that the division was in the copy and was not introduced by the folio editor.³ Perhaps a theatrical manuscript is the most likely source. The text itself is tolerably clean, and though there is much confusion of locality and some of action (which has

¹ See p. 137; and p. 182.

² But for parentheses see p. 115, note 1.

³ See p. 145; and p. 182. 'Finis actus primi' would no doubt be better Latin but is not the form used in the folio.

been thought to point to revision) it is probably no greater than can be accounted for by carelessness on the part of the author and some changes of purpose. As Chambers remarks, 'early in the season of 1594-5' is a likely date for the play, and 'the outset of the career of the Chamberlain's men was not an unlikely time for hasty composition'.

KING JOHN

It has been supposed that *King John* was printed from a prompt-book or a transcript of one. I do not feel certain of this. The most obvious indication is the act and scene division, which is unlikely to have been made by the folio editor, or indeed in the text as it stands, since Act II consists of only 75 lines. Chambers suggests that a scene has been cut out: Dover Wilson finds some confirmation of this, but it is rather tenuous, and I do not quite understand his theory, which seems on the contrary to treat the existing second act as an addition. It is not easy to see what more there could have been here, and nothing is to be found in the source play, *The Troublesome Reign of King John*, which Shakespeare followed closely as regards structure. Clearly something has gone wrong, but it is hardly possible now to tell what it is: trouble may have been caused by confused marking of the foul papers in preparation for the 'book'.¹ Wilson may be right in suspecting an interpolation in III. iv, but there seems no reason to connect it with the supposed omission earlier or to infer revision. It may have been an afterthought in writing; and the evidence of its insertion ought to have disappeared in a fair copy. No abnormal spellings have been observed, but there is some inconsistency in the directions and speech prefixes—which McKerrow overlooked—more I think than would have been allowed to stand in a carefully prepared prompt-book. There is also some confusion in the use of names in the text, which must be due to the author: the French king, whose name is Philip, sometimes appears as Lewis by confusion with the Dauphin. Modern editors

¹ The division in the folio is typographically suspicious. The heading 'Actus Secundus' lacks its customary 'Scaena Prima'—it has not even a stop after it—and there is no 'Exeunt' at the end. The headings to III. i and ii want the usual rules below them.

keeper, or even introduced by the folio editor—the play, it must be remembered, was originally intended to open the section of Tragedies—or it may possibly mean that the manuscript had been used as a prompt-book. There would be nothing impossible in this though there are no signs of it.¹

TIMON OF ATHENS

The problem in *Timon of Athens* is complicated by uncertainty over composition and authorship. Chambers supposes that the play is merely unfinished, Shakespeare having brought the beginning and end near to completion while leaving the middle imperfect. This need not have been his usual method of composition. Certainly many speeches are difficult to follow, and not only the text but the structure of the play seems incoherent. It is doubtful whether it was ever acted; indeed it hardly reads as if it were meant to be. There is no act division. The directions are in part of the same type as in the last two plays, but they become less elaborate as we proceed: 'Hautboys playing loud music. A great banquet served in: and then, Enter Lord Timon, the States, the Athenian Lords, Ventigius which Timon redeemed from prison. Then comes dropping after all Ape-mantus discontentedly, like himself', 'The Lords rise from table, with much adoring of Timon, and to show their loves, each single out an Amazon [i.e. a masquer], and all dance, men with women; a lofty strain or two to the haut-boys, and cease.' Some read almost more like directions for composition than production (cf. *All's Well*): 'Enter Lord Timon, addressing himself courteously to every Suitor'—which he proceeds to do—'Enter Varro's man, meeting others. All Timon's Creditors to wait for his coming out. Then enter . . .' The verse and prose are often chaotic, and there are traces of marginal additions. It can hardly be doubted that the play was set up from foul papers that had never been reduced to order. (See addenda, p. 182.)

¹ It is possible that the directions may have been revised at some time. Crompton Rhodes (*Shakespeare's First Folio*, pp. 132-3) has an ingenious, if confused and inaccurate, argument to show that the undoubted confusion at 1. iv. 42 is due to a literary direction being superimposed on two curt directions of the playhouse type.

CYMBELINE

The text of *Cymbeline* is clean on the whole with correct lining but some textual errors. The directions, compared for example with those in *Coriolanus*, are scanty, but some are comparable, and these become more frequent towards the end. At first we find only short directions that would be consistent with prompt copy: 'Enter Imogen in her bed, and a Lady. . . . Sleeps. Iachimo from the trunk. . . . Clock strikes', 'Fight and exeunt', 'Imogen awakes'. But others point rather to the author: 'reading of a letter', 'from the cave', 'Enter Arviragus, with Imogen dead, bearing her in his arms.' The last act contains some as elaborately descriptive as any elsewhere: 'Enter Lucius, Iachimo, and the Roman army at one door: and the Britain army at another: Leonatus Posthumus following like a poor soldier. They march over, and go out. Then enter again in skirmish Iachimo and Posthumus: he vanquisheth and disarmeth Iachimo, and then leaves him. . . . The battle continues, the Britains fly, Cymbeline is taken: then enter to his rescue . . . Enter Posthumus, and seconds the Britains. They rescue Cymbeline, and exeunt.' One is for a dumb show that is usually supposed to be a playhouse addition. On the whole the text, which is fully divided into acts and scenes, suggests to me a prompt-book that has taken over progressively more of the author's original directions for production.

THE WINTER'S TALE

The Winter's Tale is peculiar in that it may have been a late addition to the folio, and that a new prompt-book was licensed by Herbert in August 1623 since that allowed by Buc 'was missing'. These facts are probably related, but it is not clear that they have any bearing upon the nature of the text. The new 'book' may have been made with a view to printing, or in preparation for a revival recorded in January 1624. The directions are very scanty; beyond bare entrances and exits I think the following are all: 'Enter . . . Hermione (as to her trial)', 'Exit pursued by a bear', 'Here a dance of Shepherds and Shepherdesses', 'Here a dance of twelve Satyrs', 'Enter . . . Hermione (like a Statue)'. In most cases,

but not in all, the entrances are massed, with or without subsequent entry, and this has been thought to point to a transcript made from parts: at the same time there are present the same scribal peculiarities that led us to suppose that the first four texts in the folio rested on copies by Ralph Crane—and *The Winter's Tale* closes the section of Comedies. The text is remarkably clean and presents few verbal difficulties. There is no indication that the manuscript was either prepared or used as a prompt-book, nor if written to replace the lost 'book' any indication of its origin—if we reject assembly from parts. If it was a private copy it might of course have been made before the 'book' was lost and retrieved after the new one had been licensed.

THE TEMPEST

The text of *The Tempest* is clean, with remarkably careful punctuation. If the latter is Shakespeare's he took unusual pains, which he might do if he was writing at a distance from the theatre. Dover Wilson originally thought it was printed from 'author's manuscript which had served as prompt-copy'. I can find no definite evidence of use in the theatre; and, as Wilson himself later pointed out, the profuse brackets suggest Crane's work. The directions are in Shakespeare's latest manner, and those for spectacle are more elaborate than in any previous play. At the same time I am not sure that Shakespeare is alone responsible: 'Solemn and strange music, and Prosper on the top (invisible): Enter several strange shapes, bringing in a banquet; and dance about it with gentle actions and salutations, and inviting the King &c. to eat, they depart. . . . Thunder and lightning. Enter Ariel (like a Harpy), claps his wings upon the table, and with a quaint device the banquet vanishes. . . . He vanishes in thunder: then (to soft music) enter the shapes again, and dance (with mocks and mows) and carrying out the table.' This, except for the use of the present tense, is the language familiar to us in descriptions of many masques at court.¹

¹ Crompton Rhodes noticed this: *Shakespeare's First Folio*, p. 101. The descriptions in manuscripts of masques prepared for presentation at the performance were in fact sometimes at least in the present tense, and the peculiarity survives in editions printed from such manuscripts. With the direction in *The Tempest* compare, 'The

I cannot imagine an author writing notes for the producer, still less a book-keeper, using the phrase 'with a quaint device': it is descriptive of the thing seen, a compliment to the machinist. I am inclined to believe that behind the folio text is a manuscript carefully prepared by Crane, in which the author's directions were preserved and elaborated and the marks of stage use (supposing the original to have been used as a prompt-book) eliminated. The question is somewhat complicated by the fact that being the first play in the folio it may have received more care than the rest. The copy may actually have been prepared by Crane as a model for the editing of the volume.

HENRY VIII

Lastly in *Henry VIII* the stage directions are again elaborate even apart from spectacles, which are of course prominent: 'Enter Cardinal Wolsey, the purse borne before him, certain of the Guard, and two Secretaries with papers: the Cardinal in his passage, fixeth his eye on Buckingham, and Buckingham on him, both full of disdain'; 'The Order of the Coronation' fills 25 lines in the folio, the direction for the trial 18, for Katharine's vision 16, for the christening 10. They are all clearly the author's and there is no indication of prompt use. The text is a good one and the copy must have been tidy and well ordered. If the play was the work of two authors, no doubt it was carefully edited in preparing a fair copy. The prompter may not have found it necessary to annotate it, and in that case the copy for the folio may have been the 'book' itself.

It may be desirable to mention in this connexion that the text of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* as printed in quarto in 1634 presents similar features, except that it contains many prompter's notes such as warnings and actors' names. The latter however point to a date after the publication of the folio, and the book-keeper may therefore have only taken the manuscript in hand on the occasion of a revival.

Masquers are placed in an entire concave shell of mother of pearl, curiously made to move on those waters', from *The Masque of Blackness* in B.M. MS. Royal 17 B. xxxi. See Jonson, ed. Simpson, vii. 195; cf. also pp. 475, 625, 732, 746.

Our results in these seventeen plays may be summed up as follows. Four of the manuscripts used were, like *The Merry Wives*, transcripts by Crane. It is probably significant that these five together comprise the first four and the last of the Comedies. His transcripts of *The Two Gentlemen* and *The Winter's Tale* were probably and possibly made from prompt-books; that of *The Tempest* from a careful author's manuscript; that of *Measure for Measure* (like *The Merry Wives* probably) from foul papers. Another transcript from foul papers, perhaps of a literary type but not by Crane, appears to underlie *All's Well*. *King John* was probably printed, at least for the most part, directly from foul papers that had received some annotation; *Timon* from foul papers left unfinished. All the rest seem to derive from manuscripts of a more theatrical type. Regular prompt-books may lie behind *Julius Caesar*, *As you Like it*, *Twelfth Night*, *Cymbeline*, and *Macbeth*, though in the last instance the 'book' can hardly have been in its original state. *Henry VI* was most likely printed from an old manuscript that had been used as a prompt-book and later altered and revised; *The Comedy of Errors* from an author's manuscript which may perhaps have served as prompt copy. *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus* rest on autograph manuscripts carefully prepared by the author for production but showing no sign of use by the prompter; and the same is true of *Henry VIII* except that, being of composite authorship, the manuscript was probably in the hand of a scribe—at least there is no indication that it was Shakespeare's.

I have spoken rather vaguely of the 'editor' or 'editors' of the folio. By the editors I naturally mean Heminge and Condell. They signed the preface and the dedication, and it was they who made available the manuscripts in the possession of the King's company.¹ I see no reason to suppose that their

¹ In this they doubtless represented their fellow sharers. Heminge was the company's regular payee for performances at court from 1604 to 1630. Condell was Heminge's most intimate associate. Burbage, Heminge, and Condell were his three 'fellows' remembered in Shakespeare's will, and Burbage died in 1619. Evidently it was both as representatives of the King's men and as personal friends of the author that their names appear in the folio. It may be worth observing that when in 1647

responsibility went any further. But some one, or some body of men, must have undertaken the very considerable labour of preparing the manuscripts for press, in some cases transcribing them, in others collating and correcting copies of earlier quarto editions for use by the printer. A good deal of this work was no doubt more or less mechanical, but there must have been a directing brain behind it. Whose it was we have no indication. It is perhaps unlikely that Heminge and Condell, men so far as we know without experience in literary composition, themselves wrote the dedication and preface that they signed. Pollard once suggested that these were the work of Edward Blount, who appears to have been the leader of the group of publishers responsible for the venture, and was it seems a man of some literary pretensions. Steevens long ago suggested Ben Jonson as the author, and Chambers thinks Jonson's claim on the whole the better. My own private opinion is that the epistles may very well have come from his pen.¹ But I cannot see Jonson editing Shakespeare's text—at least not in the way it was edited in the folio. Blount is a possibility; and I have heard it suggested that the editor may have been one of the minor literary lights who contributed commendatory verses to the collection. One of these by the way, Hugh Holland, was a fellow of Trinity. In any case I do not doubt that there was a literary editor, who may very likely have been distinct from the collator and transcriber who did the spade work. Chambers speaks of the sophisticating editor of the folio; but he regards him as a rather shadowy character—which he certainly is—and thinks that he may have devoted most of his attention to the plays printed from manuscript. This is possible—but it is only in the plays printed from quartos

Moseley collected the unpublished plays of Beaumont and Fletcher, the dedication was signed by no less than ten former members of the King's company. They claim to have 'preserved as trustees to the ashes of the authors, what we exhibit to your Honour'; but the company had of course been some years dispersed, and they may not have had any personal responsibility in the matter. Moseley tells us that the manuscripts had been scattered and that it was he who recovered them.

¹ I find confirmation rather than refutation in the contradictory views expressed about the unblotted lines. In the preface Jonson writes in the persons of the actors, in his *Discoveries* he criticizes their opinion. (*Studies in the First Folio*, pp. 151-2.)

that we can distinguish his work with any confidence. These certainly underwent a good deal of modernization, normalization, and general tidying up in spelling, punctuation, grammar, metre, and so on. Most of this can perhaps be put down to the compositor and press reader, but I think enough remains to point to some general literary supervision.¹ I think too that there is an initial probability in its favour, for it is what we find in the second folio, and even to some extent in the later seventeenth-century reprints.² No doubt there had been time for criticism during the nine years that separated the second folio from the first, and it may have been felt that on its original appearance the collection had not received all the care it deserved. Still, in view of the great amount of labour we know to have been spent on preparing the text it seems unlikely that it was allowed to go forth without at least some editorial interference, which we ought perhaps to respect, however much we may deplore it.

¹ I have already indicated my suspicion that it was sometimes the editor rather than the prompter who reformed the profanity of the text in conformity to the Act of 1606.

² This much neglected field has been lately explored by two American scholars, M. W. Black and M. A. Shaaber, who in a monograph on *Shakespeare's Seventeenth-Century Editors, 1632-1685* (Modern Language Association of America, 1937) have demonstrated the surprising extent to which the current text is dependent upon the care and ingenuity—sometimes indeed misplaced—of the editor of the folio of 1632 in particular. It is not suggested that the emendations introduced rest on any authority outside the printing house, but they certainly show a dutiful reading of the text and occasionally real insight. There are it seems over 1600 deliberate changes in F₂, over 900 in F₃, over 700 in F₄, and 'it is remarkable that these seventeenth-century editors, in F₂ nearly a hundred years before Pope began the restoration of quarto readings by the process of collation, should, by a process of divination alone, so often have worked back to the readings of the quartos'. A classified table shows that out of 1679 changes in F₂, 623 are generally accepted by modern editors and 213 restore the readings of earlier editions. Thus almost exactly half have a presumption in their favour.

The subject had previously been touched on by Allardyce Nicoll in a paper on 'The Editors of Shakespeare from the First Folio to Malone' in *Studies in the First Folio* (Shakespeare Association, 1924). He found in the second folio the work of three distinct editors, 'one who altered five plays for metrical reasons, one who boldly attacked the comedies in order to improve their stage-directions . . . and one who chose certain of the most popular plays for careful examination. This last man was a student of both Latin and Greek, a man moreover with a considerable sense of the fitness of things.' ('We find no clear evidence to support or to gainsay this' is the rather dry comment of Black and Shaaber.) Modern criticism is thus inclined to regard as rather one-sided Malone's dictum that the editor of the second folio was one of 'the two great corrupters of our poet's text' (the other of course was Pope).

And now, in final retrospect, what do we find the editorial position in the plays of Shakespeare to be? On the whole we cannot help being impressed by the great authority of the textual tradition. It would be absurd now to take seriously the nightmare fantasies of Dr. Johnson; nor is there much excuse to indulge even in the less extravagant forms of textual scepticism that would still open the door to extremes of emendation and 'improvement'. Such an attitude of pessimism Pollard has happily described as 'sinning our mercies'. But if we have learned to approach the editing of Shakespeare in a spirit of restrained optimism, we have also learned to understand more thoroughly the complexities of the task, and still find ourselves confronted by a position both difficult and uncertain. Partly this is the result of the imperfection of our present knowledge. I have gone through the whole canon, in however superficial a manner, and have given my impressions of the manuscripts that lie behind the printed texts; but though I believe that these impressions rest on a reasonable basis and are not mere guesses in the void, I know them to be exceedingly fallible, and I should be sorry if you took them for anything more solid than they are. We may however hope in the future to achieve something more reliable. That is not altogether what I mean when I say that the position is complicated and obscure. I mean that there is often an element of uncertainty in the documents themselves that no amount of critical ingenuity can resolve. We have seen that the two most important sources of the extant texts are probably the author's foul papers and theatrical prompt-books. But foul papers are often characterized by the fact that the text has not everywhere been reduced to final form: the writer knew that it had to go through a further process that might cause disturbance and would at the same time afford an opportunity for tidying up loose ends. In a properly constructed prompt-book the text no doubt received this final revision, but we can never be sure at whose hand it received it. Worse still we can never know how far merely theatrical considerations of casting, censorship, and the like, may have wrested the text from the true intention of the author. There seems then in general no

possibility of arriving at the perfectly finished product of Shakespeare's art, for the simple reason that he never gave it a perfect finish. It is the penalty, or if you will the limitation, of the medium in which he worked—that most vital but most incalculable medium of the theatre, in which the very tools and materials of the artist are the speech, the emotions, the personalities, of actual human beings. In such an art, to the great artist at least, the written word can never be final, and he may be the less concerned to give the last polish to the script. I do not myself believe that Shakespeare, at any rate in his maturity, wrote only for the stage—he must have known and recognized and valued the enduring element of his creation—but he wrote primarily for the stage and was content that its accidents should mould the fashion of his art. I do not think that he would have laughed at those who spoke of their plays as 'Works', but I am afraid he was too easy-going to shape the text of his own with the precision with which we have come to think that it is the duty of an author to shape it. At least that was so during the stressful years of writing. If he had enjoyed a longer evening of leisure, who can say what might not have happened? Did he sometimes dream in his garden at Stratford of a great volume of his plays, such as his friend Jonson was busy preparing? and did he go so far as to talk over the idea with his old colleagues when they visited him in those last peaceful days? 'It had been a thing, we confess, worthy to have been wished, that the author himself had *lived* to have set forth and overseen his own writings; but since it hath been ordained otherwise, and he *by death* departed from that right . . .' Is this merely rhetorical regret, or is it a hint of a project actually discussed? We can never know. Only we can say that had the dream come true the editorial problem in Shakespeare might have been very different from what it is.

APPENDIX OF ILLUSTRATIVE STAGE DIRECTIONS

STAGE directions are often so illuminating for the history of the texts in which they occur and I have made so much use of their evidence that I think I ought to give a representative selection to enable the reader to judge for himself in the matter. So far as plays first printed in the folio are concerned I have perhaps quoted enough directions in my final lecture to serve the purpose, but the following gleaned from plays that had previously appeared in quarto may be found helpful. Although the lists look forbidding, I believe that any one who has the patience to work through them in detail, comparing the directions as they appear in the different texts, will find them a fascinating study. I may perhaps mention that fairly extensive transcripts of directions from the manuscript plays discussed in my second lecture are given in *Elizabethan Dramatic Documents*, pp. 239-366.

My object in gathering these directions has been twofold. In the first place I wished to afford material for an attempt to discriminate between the directions typical respectively of the author, of the playhouse reviser (the book-keeper or prompter), and of the reporter. My second aim was to throw light on the relation of the various texts (usually the quarto and the folio) to one another—the problem to which my third, fourth, and fifth lectures were largely devoted. In cases where the directions in the several texts differ considerably they are given in separate lists. When this is so, superior numerals indicate the corresponding directions in the different texts, while stars distinguish those that appear in one text only. (When a direction has neither a star nor a number it means that there is a corresponding direction in the other text, but that it presents no point of interest and is therefore not quoted.) On the other hand, where the directions in the two texts are in general agreement only one list is given. This consists of the quarto directions, all significant differences in the folio being indicated by the use of square brackets, additions being printed in roman and substitutions in italic type. Throughout pointed brackets contain explanatory additions.¹

This may be a convenient place to add a note on the book-keeper or prompter, whom I have held responsible for playhouse directions. The book-keeper was properly the person charged with the custody of the company's stock of 'books'. Presumably it was his business to see to the writing of the prompt-book, to prepare it in accordance with

¹ Special features in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* and *The Taming of the Shrew* have necessitated treating these plays somewhat differently from the rest.

the needs of production, and to provide for its safe custody. I suppose he also attended to the writing of the plot and the actors' parts. The technical name for the prompter was the 'book-holder'—actors still speak of 'holding the book', as Nashe does in *Summer's Last Will* (ed. McKerrow, l. 1820). It does not perhaps necessarily follow that the book-keeper and the book-holder were always the same person, but since it would be difficult to distinguish their functions it is simpler to assume that they were. The references collected by Chambers (*William Shakespeare*, i. 106) certainly show that the terms book-keeper and prompter were often used indifferently, and I have followed his lead in treating them as synonymous.

2 and 3 *Henry VI* (p. 52)

The following is an attempt to give a conspectus of the more important and characteristic directions in the two versions of the two parts.

2 *Henry VI* (= 1 *Contention*)

Folio: 'Flourish of trumpets: then hautboys. Enter King . . . on the one side. The Queen . . . on the other.' 'Exit King, Queen, and Suffolk. Manet the rest.' 'Enter three or four Petitioners, the Armourer's Man being one.' '〈Queen〉 Teare the supplication.' 'She 〈the Queen〉 gives the Duchess a box on the ear.' 'Enter the Witch, the two Priests, and Bullingbrook. . . Enter Elianor aloft. . . Here do the ceremonies belonging, and make the circle, Bullingbrook or Southwell reads, *Conjuro te, &c.* It thunders and lightens terribly: then the Spirit riseth.' 'Enter the King, Queen . . . with Falconers hallowing.' 'Sound trumpets. Enter the King and State, with Guard, to banish the Duchess.' 'Enter at one door the Armourer and his Neighbours, drinking to him so much, that he is drunk; and he enters with a Drum before him, and his staff, with a sand-bag fastened to it: and at the other door his Man, with a drum and sand-bag, and Prentices drinking to him.' 'Sound a sennet. Enter King, Queen, Cardinal, Suffolk, York, Buckingham, Salisbury, and Warwick, to the Parliament.' 'Enter two or three running over the stage, from the murther of Duke Humphrey. . . Exeunt.' 'Bed put forth.' 'Enter Bevis, and John Holland 〈Q 'two of the Rebels'〉.' 'Drum. Enter Cade . . . with infinite numbers.' 'Enter Lord Scales upon the Tower walking. Then enters two or three Citizens below.' 'Enter Jack Cade and the rest, and strikes his staff on London Stone.' 'Enter one with the heads.' 'Alarum and retreat. Enter again Cade and all his rabblement.' 'Sound trumpets. Enter King, Queen, and Somerset on the terrace.' 'Enter multitudes with

halts about their necks.' 'Enter York, and his army of Irish, with Drum and Colours.' *Alarum afar off.'

Quarto: ¹'Enter at one door, King Henry the sixth . . . Enter at the other door . . . Queen Margaret . . . ' *Duke Humphrey lets it <a paper> fall.' ²'Exet King, Queen, and Suffolk, and Duke Humphrey stays all the rest.' ³'Enter two Petitioners, and Peter the Armourer's man.' 'Enter the Duke of Suffolk with the Queen, and they take him for Duke Humphrey, and gives him their writings.' ⁴'He <Suffolk> tears the papers.' 'Enter King Henry, and the Duke of York and the Duke of Somerset on both sides of the King, whispering with him, and enter Duke Humphrey, Dame Elnor . . . ' ⁵'The Queen lets fall her glove, and hits the Duchess of Gloster, a box on the ear. . . She <the Queen> strikes her <the Duchess>.' ⁶'Enter Elnor, with Sir John Hum, Roger Bullenbrook a conjurer, and Margery Jourdain a witch. . . She <Elnor> goes up to the tower. . . She <Margery> lies down upon her face. Bullenbrook makes a circle. . . It thunders and lightens, and then the Spirit riseth up.' ⁷'Enter the King and Queen with her hawk on her fist . . . as if they came from hawking.' ⁸'Enter King Henry, and the Queen, Duke Humphrey, the Duke of Suffolk, and the Duke of Buckingham, the Cardinal, and Dame Elnor Cobham, led with the Officers, and then enter to them the Duke of York, and the Earls of Salisbury and Warwick.' ⁹<Verbally as in F, except 'drunken'.> ¹⁰'Enter to the Parliament. Enter two Heralds before, then the Duke of Buckingham, and the Duke of Suffolke, and then the Duke of York, and the Cardinal of Winchester, and then the King and the Queen, and then the Earl of Salisbury, and the Earl of Warwick.' ¹¹'Then the curtains being drawn, Duke Humphrey is discovered in his bed, and two men lying on his breast and smothering him in his bed. And then enter the Duke of Suffolk to them. . . Exet Murderers.' ¹²'Warwick draws the curtains and shows Duke Humphrey in his bed.' *She <the Queen> kisseth him <Suffolk>.' *He <Suffolk> starteth.' *He <Cade> knights Dick Butcher.' ¹³'Enter the Lord Scales upon the Tower walls walking. Enter three or four Citizens below.' ¹⁴'Enter Jack Cade and the rest, and strikes his sword upon London Stone.' ¹⁵'Enter two with the Lord Say's head, and Sir James Cromer's, upon two poles.' *They forsake Cade. . . They run to Cade again. . . He <Cade> runs through them with his staff, and flies away <F 'Exit'>.' ¹⁶'Enter the Duke of Buckingham and Clifford, with the Rebels, with halts about their necks.' 'Alarms to the battle, and then enter the Duke of Somerset and Richard fighting, and Richard kills him under the sign of the Castle in Saint Albans.' 'Alarms, then enter young Clifford alone. . . *He takes him <his father> up on his back. . . *Enter Richard, and then Clifford lays

down his father, fights with him, and Richard flies away again. . . .
 *Exet young Clifford with his father.'

3 *Henry VI (= True Tragedy)*

Folio: 'They <York &c.> go up. . . . He <Warwick> stamps with his foot, and the Soldiers show themselves. . . . Sennet. Here they come down.' 'Enter Gabriel' <Q 'Messenger'>. 'A march afar off.' *'A short alarum within.' *'Enter one blowing.' ¹'Alarum. Enter a Son that hath killed his father, at one door: and a Father that hath killed his son at another door. . . . Enter Father, bearing of his son. . . . Exit.' ²'Enter Sinklo, and Humphrey, with cross-bows in their hands. . . . Enter the King with a prayer book.' ³'Flourish. Enter Lewis the French King, his sister Bona, his Admiral, called Bourbon: Prince Edward, Queen Margaret, and the Earl of Oxford. *Lewis sits, and riseth up again. . . . *'Lewis' Seats her <Margaret> by him. . . . *He descends. She ariseth. . . . *'Warwick' Speaking to Bona. . . . *They <Margaret &c.> stand aloof. . . . *'Bona' Speaks to War. . . . ⁴Post blowing a horn within. . . . *'Post' Speaks to Warwick. . . . *To Lewis. . . . *To Margaret. . . . *They all read their letters. . . . *He <Prince Edward> gives his hand to Warw.' 'Enter Richard . . . Flourish. Enter King Edward . . . four stand on one side, and four on the other.' 'Enter Warwick and Oxford in England, with French Soldiers. . . . *They all cry, *Henry*.' *'Enter three Watchmen to guard the King's tent. . . . *Enter Warwick . . . and French Soldiers, silent all. . . . ⁵Warwick and the rest cry all, *Warwick, Warwick*, and set upon the Guard, who fly, crying, *Arm, Arm*, Warwick and the rest following them. The drum playing and trumpet sounding: Enter Warwick, Somerset, and the rest, bringing the King out in his gown, sitting in a chair: Richard and Hastings flies over the stage. . . . *'Warwick' Takes off his <Edward's> crown. . . . ⁶'They lead him <Edward> out forcibly.' *'King Henry' Lays his hand on his <Richmond's> head.' ⁷'Enter the Mayor, and two Aldermen. . . . <Edward> Takes the keys.' *'The Drum begins to march.' *'Montgomery' Throws down his gauntlet.' *'Here they bear away his <Warwick's> body <Q 'He dies'>.' ⁸'Richard' Stabs him <Henry>. . . . Dies. . . . Stabs him again.'

Quarto: 'Enter Richard Duke of York . . . with white roses in their hats. . . . Enter King Henry the sixt . . . with red roses in their hats.' *'Three suns appear in the air.' 'Enter the House of York.' 'Alarms. They fight, and then enters Warwick and rescues Richard and then exeunt omnes.' ¹'Enter a Soldier with a dead man in his arms. . . . Enter another Soldier with a dead man. . . . Exit with his father. . . . Exit with his son.' 'Enter Clifford wounded, with an arrow in his

neck.' ²'Enter two keepers with bow and arrows. . . . Enter King Henry disguised.' ³'Enter King Lewis and the Lady Bona, and Queen Margaret, Prince Edward, and Oxford and others. . . . ⁴'Sound for a Post within.' ⁵'Alarms, and Gloster and Hastings flies. . . . ⁶'Exeunt some with Edward.' ⁷'Enter Edward . . . with a troop of Hollanders.' ⁸'The Mayor opens the door, and brings the keys in his hand.' ⁹'Sound a parley, and Richard and Clarence whispers together, and then Clarence takes his red rose out of his hat, and throws it at Warwick.' ¹⁰'Alarms to the battle, York flies, then the chambers be discharged. Then enter the King, Cla. and Glo. and the rest, and make a great shout and cry, *for York, for York*, and then the Queen is taken, and the Prince, and Oxf. and Sum., and then sound and enter all again.' ¹¹'He <Richard> stabs him <Henry>. . . . He dies. . . . Stab him again.'

The difference in the directions between the two parts is striking. Part 2 is remarkable for their length and elaboration in both versions. It is clear that Q was carefully edited in this respect. In part 3 there are fewer long directions but the number of short ones is very large. Moreover in part 2 there are many directions peculiar to Q and very few peculiar to F, whereas in part 3 the position is reversed. In part 3 the directions of the two versions show no particular similarity (except in 8), whereas in part 2 similarity is frequent and sometimes striking. Chambers explains the resemblance by the use of a plot in the preparation of Q. But such a direction as 9 could never have appeared in a plot. I think there can be no doubt that Q was itself consulted for the directions of F, as it was for certain passages of the text. I suggest that 9 was taken over bodily. In 10 the words 'to the Parliament' were lifted from the beginning in Q to be added at the end in F. In 16 'with halters about their necks' was borrowed from Q; but the 'multitudes' must be due to the author. Both 13 and 14 occur in a passage admittedly taken over from Q. The substitution of 'staff' for 'sword' may have been accidental, or possibly due to the insistence on the staves of the rebels in Q (and cf. 9) and to the subsequent mention of Cade's staff in a direction peculiar to Q.

Romeo and Juliet (p. 61)

The following are the more significant directions in the two quartos.

Second Quarto: ¹'Enter Sampson and Gregory, with swords and bucklers, of the house of Capulet.' ²'Enter two other Servingmen.' ³'They fight. . . . Enter Tybalt. . . . Enter three or four Citizens with clubs or partizans. . . . Enter old Capulet in his gown, and his Wife. . . .

Enter old Montague and his Wife. . . . Enter Prince Escalus, with his train.' 4'Enter Capulet's Wife and Nurse.' 5'Enter Romeo, Mercutio, Benvolio, with five or six other Maskers, Torchbearers. . . . *They march about the stage, and Servingmen come forth with napkins. Enter Romeo <error, 'Servant' in F>. . . . *Exeunt <Servingmen>. 6'Enter all the Guests and Gentlewomen to the Maskers. . . . *Music plays and they dance.' *'Enter Juliet again.' 7'Enter Friar alone with a basket.' 'Enter Tybalt, Petruchio <a ghost>, and others.' 8'Away Tybalt.' 9'They <Romeo and Tybalt> fight. Tybalt falls.' 10'Enter Prince, old Montague, Capulet, their Wives and all.' 11'Enter Nurse with cords.' 12'Enter Romeo and Juliet aloft.' 13'Enter Father Capulet, Mother, Nurse, and Servingmen, two or three.' 14'Enter Lady of the House and Nurse. . . . Enter old Capulet.' 15'Enter three or four with spits and logs, and baskets.' *'Play music.' 16'Exeunt manet <Nurse>. . . . Exit omnes <error>. Enter Will Kemp.' 17'Enter Paris and his Page. . . . 18Whistle Boy. . . . Enter Romeo and Peter <=Balthazar>.' 19'Enter Friar with lanthorn, crow, and spade.'

First Quarto: 1'Enter two Servingmen of the Capolets.' 2'Enter two Servingmen of the Montagues.' 3'They draw, to them enters Tybalt, they fight, to them the Prince, old Montague and his Wife, old Capulet and his Wife, and other Citizens and part them.' 4'Enter Capulet's Wife and Nurse.' 5'Enter Maskers with Romeo and a Page.' 6'Enter old Capulet with the Ladies.' 7'Enter Friar Francis.' 'Enter Juliet somewhat fast, and embraceth Romeo.' 8'Tybalt under Romeo's arm thrusts Mercutio, in and flies.' 9'<Romeo and Tybalt> Fight, Tybalt falls.' 10'Enter Prince, Capolet's Wife.' 11'Enter Nurse wringing her hands, with the ladder of cords in her lap.' *'He <Romeo> offers to stab himself, and Nurse snatches the dagger away. . . . Nurse offers to go in and turns again.' 12'Enter Romeo and Juliet at the window. . . . *He goeth down. . . . *She goeth down from the window.' *'She looks after Nurse.' 13'Enter old Capolet, his Wife, Nurse, and Servingman.' *'She falls upon her bed within the curtains.' 14'Enter Nurse with herbs, Mother. . . . Enter Oldman <Capulet>.' 15'Enter Servingman with logs and coals.' *'All at once cry out and wring their hands.' 16'They all but the Nurse go forth, casting rosemary on her and shutting the curtains. Enter Musicians. . . . Exit <Nurse>. . . . Enter Servingman.' 17'Enter County Paris and his Page with flowers and sweet water. . . . *Paris strews the tomb with flowers. . . . 18Boy whistles and calls, *My lord*. Enter Romeo and Balthazar, with a torch, a mattock, and a crow of iron. . . . *Romeo opens the tomb.' 19'Enter Friar with a lanthorn. . . . *Friar stoops and looks on the blood and weapons. . . . *Juliet rises.'

Though the directions generally run parallel in the two texts there

is very little close correspondence: 4 and 9 seem the only instances that might suggest borrowing. It is remarkable that in Q1 the directions grow proportionately more extensive as the play proceeds—perhaps the result of the reporter relying more on description as his recollection of the words was less, though there is no direct translation of dialogue into action (but see 3). Whoever wrote the Q1 directions had an intimate knowledge of the play and of the traditional stage business, such as the book-keeper would acquire; moreover he gives the impression of being concerned with production as well as description.

Hamlet (p. 64)

The following are the more significant directions as they appear in the three texts. (A complete list, including those of the Globe edition, is given by Dover Wilson, *The Manuscript of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet'*, Appendix D, ii. 353–69.)

Second Quarto: '1 Enter Barnardo, and Francisco, two centinels. . . . 2 Enter Horatio, and Marcellus.' '3 Enter Ghost. . . . *It spreads his arms. . . . *The cock crows.' '4 Flourish. Enter Claudius, King of Denmark, Gertrud the Queen, Counsel: as Polonius, and his son Laertes, Hamlet, cum aliis.' '5 Flourish. Exeunt all, but Hamlet.' '6 Enter Laertes, and Ophelia his sister.' '7 A flourish of trumpets and two pieces goes off.' '8 <Ghost> Beckons.' '9 Ghost cries under the stage.' '10 Enter old Polonius, with his man or two.' '11 Flourish. Enter King and Queen, Rosencraus and Guyldensterne.' '12 Enter Embassadors.' '13 A flourish. . . . 14 Enter Polonius. . . . 15 Enter the Players.' '16 Enter Hamlet, and three of the Players.' '17 Exeunt they two <Guyldensterne and Rosencraus>.' '18 Enter Trumpets and Kettle-drums, King, Queen, Polonius, Ophelia.' '19 Enter the Players with recorders.' '20 Enter Ghost.' '21 Exit <Hamlet>.' '22 Enter King, and two or three. . . . Enter Rosencraus and all the rest. . . . They <Hamlet and Guard> enter.' '23 Enter Fortinbras with his army over the stage. . . . *Enter Hamlet, Rosencraus, &c.' '24 Enter Ophelia. . . . *She sings. . . . *Song. . . . *Song.' '25 A noise within. . . . Enter Laertes with others.' '26 A noise within. Enter Ophelia.' '27 Enter Hamlet and Horatio.' '28 Enter K. Q. Laertes and the corse.' '30 Enter a Courtier.' '31 A table prepared, Trumpets, Drums, and Officers with cushions, King, Queen, and all the State, foils, daggers, and Laertes.' '*Trumpets the while <the King drinks>. . . . 33 Drum, trumpets, and shot. Flourish, a piece goes off.' '37 A march afar off. . . . 39 Enter Fortinbras, with the Embassadors. . . . 40 Exeunt.'

(Note that Hamlet's asides in the play scene, 'That's wormwood'

and 'If she should break it now', were evidently written (with prefix) in the margin. It is just possible that his words 'What say you?' at v. ii. 296 were similarly added, since they are divided by a space from the rest of his speech. For similar marginalia in *Romeo and Juliet* see p. 61, note 2.)

Folio: 'Enter Barnardo and Francisco two centinels. . . . 2'Enter Horatio and Marcellus.' 3'Enter Ghost again.' 4'Enter Claudius King of Denmark, Gertrude the Queen, Hamlet, Polonius, Laertes and his sister Ophelia, Lords attendant. . . . Enter Voltemand and Cornelius.' 5'Exeunt. Manet Hamlet.' 6'Enter Laertes and Ophelia.' 8'Ghost beckons Hamlet.' 9'Ghost cries under the stage.' 10'Enter Polonius and Reynoldo.' 11'Enter King, Queen, Rosincrane, and Guildensterne, cum aliis.' 12'Enter Polonius, Voltumand, and Cornelius.' 13'Flourish for the Players. . . . 14'Enter Polonius. . . . 15'Enter four or five Players.' 16'Enter Hamlet, and two or three of the Players.' 17'Exeunt.' 18'Enter King, Queen, Polonius, Ophelia, Rosincrance, Guildensterne, and other Lords attendant, with his Guard carrying torches. Danish march. Sound a flourish.' *'〈Lucianus〉 Pours the poison in his 〈the King's〉 eares.' 19'Enter one with a Recorder.' *'〈Hamlet〉 Kills Polonius.' 20'Enter Ghost.' 21'Exit Hamlet tugging in Polonius.' 22'Enter King. . . . Enter Rosincrane. . . . Enter Hamlet and Guildensterne.' 23'Enter Fortinbras with an army.' 24'Enter Ophelia distracted.' 25'Noise within. Enter Laertes.' 26'A noise within: *Let her come in.* Enter Ophelia.' 27'Enter Hamlet and Horatio afar off.' 28'Enter King, Queen, Laertes, and a coffin, with Lords attendant.' 29'〈Laertes〉 Leaps in the grave.' 30'Enter young Osrick.' 31'Enter King, Queen, Laertes, and Lords, with other Attendants with foils, and gauntlets, a table and flagons of wine on it.' *'Prepare to play. . . . 32'They play. . . . 33'Trumpets sound, and a shot goes off. . . . 34'In scuffling they change rapiers. . . . *'〈Hamlet〉 Hurts the King. . . . 35'King dies. . . . 36'〈Laertes〉 Dies.' 37'March afar off, and shout within. . . . 38'〈Hamlet〉 Dies. . . . 39'Enter Fortinbras and English Ambassador, with Drum, Colours, and Attendants. . . . 40'Exeunt marching: after the which, a peal of ordnance are shot off.'

First Quarto: 'Enter two Centinels. . . . 2'Enter Horatio and Marcellus.' 3'Enter the Ghost.' 4'Enter King, Queen, Hamlet, Leartes, Corambis, and the two Ambassadors, with Attendants.' 5'Exeunt all but Hamlet.' 6'Enter Leartes and Ofelia.' 7'Sound trumpets.' 9'The Ghost under the stage.' 10'Enter Corambis, and Montano.' 11'Enter King and Queen, Rossencraft, and Gilderstone.' 12'Enter the Ambassadors.' 13'The trumpets sound, 14'Enter Corambis. . . . 15'Enter Players.' 16'Enter Hamlet and the Players.' 18'Enter King, Queen, Corambis, and other Lords.' 20'Enter the Ghost in his night gown.'

21'Exit Hamlet with the dead body.' 22'Enter Hamlet and the Lords.'
 23'Enter Fortenbras, Drum and Soldiers.' 24'Enter Ofelia playing on
 a lute, and her hair down, singing.' 25'A noise within. Enter Leartes.'
 26'Enter Ofelia as before.' 27'Enter Hamlet and Horatio. . . . *He
 <Gravedigger> throws up a shovel.' 28'Enter King and Queen,
 Leartes, and other Lords, with a Priest after the coffin.' 29'Leartes
 leaps into the grave. . . . *Hamlet leaps in after Leartes.' 30'Enter a
 Braggart Gentleman.' 31'Enter King, Queen, Leartes, Lords.'
 32'Here they play. . . . *They play again. . . . *She <the Queen> drinks.
 . . . 34'They catch one another's rapiers, and both are wounded, Leartes
 falls down, the Queen falls down and dies. . . . 35'The King dies.
 . . . 36'Leartes dies. . . . 38'Ham. dies.' 39'Enter Voltemar <error> and
 the Ambassadors from England. Enter Fortinbras with his train.'

The directions of Q1 are much what we should expect to find in
 a report that had undergone no very careful editing. Action and
 appearance are sometimes vividly remembered (as in 20, 24, 29, 30,
 34, and the directions peculiar to this text) but little attempt seems to
 have been made to regulate performance in any orderly way. There
 is no clear correspondence with the other texts beyond what would
 naturally result from the common situation (but see 1, 9, 29).

Q2 has in the main author's directions, but they are not of an
 elaborate type. They are sometimes rather vague and occasionally
 indefinite in number (e.g. 10, 17, 22, 28); but some of those peculiar
 to this text are sharply imagined, as are also such details as kettle-
 drums (18, cf. 1. iv. 11) and cushions (31). The demand for flourishes
 is generally more characteristic of the prompter. He may of course
 have added some of them when reading through the foul papers. As
 Wilson observes, there is certainly a duplication in 33.

But if this is so, or indeed in any case, it is very difficult to derive the
 directions of F from those of Q2. There is a common basis, of course,
 and F conflates the alternatives in 33. But flourishes are generally
 absent, and 21 would naturally be put down as a typical author's direc-
 tion. Chambers remarks that indefiniteness has been cleared up: so it
 has in 10, 12, 22, 28; on the other hand in 15 and 16 indefiniteness
 is rather on the side of F. One can understand a prompt-book failing
 to make a number definite; it is less easy to see how it could introduce
 an unspecified number. Chambers also pertinently observes that 'it is
 not obvious that some fresh notes for action, especially in the graveyard
 and duel scenes, would be required' by the prompter. A curious point
 is that the rather unusual phrase 'cum aliis' is found at different places
 in Q2 (4) and F(11). No less surprising is 26 which seems to con-
 tain a fragment of text. This is unexpected in a prompt-book, and if
 the arrangement of Q2 is correct seems inexplicable. But the words

are not appropriate to Laertes, and Q2 is probably wrong in making them part of his speech. If they are a cry without, their position in F is reasonable. On the whole there seems to be something not explained in the relation of the directions that leaves an uncomfortable feeling of uncertainty.

A tabular analysis of the long direction for the dumb show yields nothing significant. The correspondence of Q1 with the other texts results merely from its representing the same action. The wording has been somewhat revised in F, but the only two important differences between it and Q2 appear to be due to accidental omissions in the latter.

Henry V (p. 68)

The more significant directions in the two texts are as follows.

Folio: *'Enter the two Bishops of Canterbury and Ely.' 1'Enter the King, Humphrey, Bedford, Clarence, Warwick, Westmorland, and Exeter. . . . Enter two Bishops.' 2'Enter Pistol, and Quickly.' 3'Sound trumpets. Enter the King, Scroope, Cambridge, and Gray.' *'Enter the King, Exeter, Bedford, and Gloucester. Alarum: scaling ladders at Harflew. . . . Alarum, and chambers go off.' 4'Enter Fluellen. . . . *Enter Makmorrice, and Captain Jamy. . . . *A parley.' 5'Enter the King and all his train before the gates. . . . *Flourish, and enter the town.' 6'Enter Katharine and an old Gentlewoman.' 7'Enter Captains, English and Welsh, Gower and Fluellen.' 8'Drum and Colours. Enter the King and his poor Soldiers.' 9'Enter three soldiers, John Bates, Alexander Court, and Michael Williams.' 10'Tucket. Enter Mountjoy.' 11'Enter at one door, King Henry, Exeter, Bedford, Warwick, and other Lords. At another, Queen Isabel, the King, the Duke of Bourgogne, and other French. . . . Exeunt omnes. Manet King and Katherine.' 12'Enter the French power, and the English Lords.' (In 7 the names may have been added by the book-keeper.)

Quarto: 1'Enter King Henry, Exeter, two Bishops, Clarence, and other Attendants.' 2'Enter Pistol and Hostess Quickly, his wife.' 3'Enter the King and three Lords.' 4'Enter Fluellen and beats them <Nym &c.> in.' 5'Enter the King and his Lords, alarum.' 6'Enter Katherine, Alice.' 7'Enter Gower.' 8'Enter King, Clarence, Gloster and others.' 9'Enter three Soldiers.' 10'Enter the Herald from the French.' 11'Enter at one door, the King of England and his Lords. And at the other door, the King of France, Queen <and> Katherine, the Duke of Burbon, and others. . . . Exit King and the Lords. Manet, Harry, Katherine, and the Gentlewoman.'

The Merry Wives of Windsor (p. 70)

The peculiarities of F may be illustrated by placing its directions for the first and last scenes by the side of those of Q, thus:

i. i. 1 'Enter Justice Shallow, Slender, Sir Hugh Evans, Master Page, Falstaff, Bardolph, Nym, Pistol, Anne Page, Mistress Ford, Mistress Page, Simple. . . (326) Exeunt.' [Q: 'Enter Justice Shallow, Sir Hugh, Master Page, and Slender. . . (112) Enter Sir John Falstaff, Pistol, Bardolph, and Nym. . . (195) Enter Mistress Ford, Mistress Page, and her daughter Anne. . . (200) Sir John kisses her <Mistress Ford>. . . (204) Exit all, but Slender and Mistress Anne. . . (313) Enter Master Page. . . (326) Exit omnes.']

v. v. 1 'Enter Falstaff, Mistress Page, Mistress Ford, Evans, Anne Page, Fairies, Page, Ford, Quickly, Slender, Fenton, Caius, Pistol. . . (41) Enter Fairies. . . (259) Exeunt.' [Q: 'Enter Sir John with a buck's head upon him. . . (18) Enter Mistress Page, and Mistress Ford. . . (40) There is a noise of horns, the two women run away. Enter Sir Hugh like a Satyr, and Boys dressed like Fairies, Mistress Quickly, like the Queen of Fairies: they sing a song about him <Falstaff>, and afterward speak. . . (92) They put the tapers to his fingers, and he starts. . . (106) Here they pinch him, and sing about him, and the Doctor comes one way and steals away a Boy in red. And Slender another way, he takes a Boy in green: and Fenton steals Mistress Anne, being in white. And a noise of hunting is made within: and all the Fairies run away. Falstaff pulls off his buck's head, and rises up. And enters M. Page, M. Ford, and their Wives, M. Shallow, Sir Hugh. . . (217) Enter the Doctor. . . (187) Enter Slender. . . (228) Enter Fenton and Anne. . . (259) Exit omnes.']

Other characteristic directions in Q are as follows:

'Enter Sir Hugh and Simple, from dinner.' 'Enter Sir John Falstaff's Host of the Garter . . . and the Boy.' 'He <Simple> steps into the counting-house. . . And she <Quickly> opens the door. . . The Doctor writes.' 'Enter Mistress Page, reading of a letter.' 'Ford and the Host talks.' 'Enter Ford disguised like Brook.' 'Enter Doctor and the Host, they <Doctor and Sir Hugh> offer to fight.' 'Enter Mistress Ford, with two of her men, and a great buck basket. . . Falstaff stands behind the arras. . . Sir John goes into the basket, they put clothes over him, the two men carries it away: Ford meets it, and all the rest . . . ' 'Enter Falstaff disguised like an old woman, and Mistress Page with him, Ford beats him, and he runs away.'

The Taming of the Shrew (p. 72)

The folio and quarto versions are too divergent for any consistent

comparison of the directions to be possible. I have however introduced reference numbers to draw attention to points of contact, and have distinguished with a star those portions of the framework that are found in Q but not in F.

Folio: 'Enter Beggar and Hostess, Christophero Sly. . . <Sly> Falls asleep. Wind horns. Enter a Lord from hunting, with his train. . . Enter Servingman. . . Enter Players.' 2'Enter aloft the Drunkard with Attendants, some with apparel, bason and ewer, and other appurtenances, and Lord. . . Enter Lady with Attendants.' 3'Enter Baptista with his two daughters, Katerina and Bianca, Gremio a pantaloone, Hortensio sister <read suitor> to Bianca. Lucen<tio>, Tranio, stand by.' 4'The Presenters above speaks. . . They sit and mark.' 'He <Petruchio> wrings him <Grumio> by the ears.' 'Enter Tranio brave, and Biondello.' '<Katerina> Strikes her <Bianca>. . . Flies after Bianca.' 5'Enter Gremio, Lucentio, in the habit of a mean man, Petruchio with Tranio, with his Boy bearing a lute and books. . . Enter Hortensio with his head broke.' 'Enter Baptista. . . and others, Attendants. . . Exit <Katerina> weeping.' 6'Enter four or five Servingmen. . . Enter Servants with supper. . . Enter one with water.' 7'Enter Katherina and Grumio. . . <Katerina> Beats him. . . Enter Petruchio, and Hortensio with meat.' 8'Enter Tailor. . . Enter Haberdasher.' 'Enter Baptista and Lucentio: Pedant booted and bare-headed.' 9'Enter Vincentio.' 'Enter Biondello. . . Gremio is out before. . . Pedant looks out of the window. . . Exit Biondello, Tranio and Pedant as fast as may be. . . <Lucentio> Kneele.' 10'Enter Baptista. . . and Widow: the Servingmen with Tranio bringing in a banquet. . . <Petruchio> Drinks to Hortensio. . . Enter Kate, Bianca, and Widow.'

Quarto: 'Enter a Tapster, beating out of his doors Sly drunken. . . He <Sly> falls asleep. Enter a Nobleman and his men from hunting. . . Exeunt two with Sly. . . Enter one. . . Enter two of the players with packs at their backs, and a boy.' 2'Enter two with a table and a banquet on it, and two other, with Sly asleep in a chair, richly apparelled, and the music playing. . . Enter the Lord and his men. . . Enter the Boy in woman's attire. . . Sound trumpets.' 3'Enter two young Gentlemen, and a man and a boy. . . Enter Simon, Alphonsus, and his three daughters.' 'Enter Ferando and his man Saunders with a blue coat.' 'She <Kate> turns aside and speaks. . . Enter Saundier laughing.' 4'Then Sly speaks.' 5'Enter Valeria with a lute and Kate with him. . . She plays. . . She offers to strike him with the lute. . . She throws it down.' 'Enter Ferando basely attired, and a red cap on his head.' 6'Enter Sanders with two or three Servingmen. . . Enter Ferando and Kate. . . He beats them all. They cover the board and fetch in the meat. . .

He throws down the table and meat and all, and beats them. . . . Exit Ferando and Kate. Manent Servingmen and eat up all the meat.' 7'Enter Sander and his Mistress. . . . She beats him. . . . Enter Ferando with a piece of meat upon his dagger's point and Polidor with him.' 8'She <Kate> sets it <the cap> on her head. . . . Enter the Tailor with a gown.' 9'Enter the Duke of Cestus alone. . . . Ferando speaks to the Old Man <the Duke>.' 'Phylotus and Valeria runs away. *Then Sly speaks. . . . *Sly drinks and then falls asleep.' *'Sly sleeps.' 10'Enter Ferando . . . Enter Kate and Sander. . . . She takes off her cap and treads on it. . . . Enter Kate thrusting Phylema and Emelia before her, and makes them come unto their husbands' call. . . . She lays her hand under her husband's feet.' *'Then enter two bearing Sly in his own apparel again, and leaves him where they found him, and then goes out. Then enter the Tapster. . . . Exeunt omnes.' (The last entrance direction is printed as part of the text and divided as verse.)

Pericles (p. 74)

The more characteristic directions are as follows:

'Enter Pericles with his Lords. . . . Enter all the Lords to Pericles <duplication>.' 'Enter the two Fishermen, drawing up a net.' 'The first Knight passes by. . . . The second Knight. . . . Great shouts, and all cry, *The mean Knight*. Enter the King and Knights from tilting. . . . They dance.' 'Enter two or three Lords.' 'Enter the King reading of a letter at one door, the Knights meet him.' 'Enter Pericles a ship-board.' 'Enter two or three with a chest. . . . Enter one with napkins and fire. . . . She <Thaisa> moves. . . . They carry her away.' 'Enter Marina with a basket of flowers.' 'Enter the three Bawds.' 'Enter Bawds 3.' 'Enter Helicanus, to him two Sailors. . . . Enter two or three Gentlemen. . . . The song <no text>. . . . <Enter> Diana.'

The character of the directions seems constant throughout. There are three dumb shows; the description of the second runs:

'Enter Pericles and Simonides at one door with attendants, a Messenger meets them, kneels and gives Pericles a letter, Pericles shows it Simonides, the Lords kneel to him; then enter Thaisa with child, with Lychorida a nurse, the King shows her the letter, she rejoices: she and Pericles take leave of her father, and depart.'

Richard III (p. 77)

A comparison of the directions in the two texts brings out many points of interest. Since F was actually set up from Q, I give the quarto directions first. I print in italic those in passages where F is derived from Q3.

Quarto: 'Enter Richard Duke of Gloucester, solus.' 'Enter Clarence with a guard of men.' 'Enter Lady Anne with the hearse of Harry the 6. . . .4She spitteth at him <Richard>. . . .5Here she lets fall the sword.' 'Enter Queen7'Enter Executioners.' '8'Enter Clarence, Brokenbury.' '9'Enter King, Queen . . . &c.' '10'Enter Duchess of York, with Clarence' Children.' '11'Enter the Quee.' '12'Enter Cardinal13'*The trumpets sound. Enter young Prince . . . Cardinal, &c.*' '14'*Exeunt Prin. . . .manet Rich. Buck.*' '15'Enter a Messenger to Lo: Hastings. . . .16'Enter Hastin<gs>. a Pursuant. . . .17'He gives him his purse.' '18'Enter Sir Richard Ratcliff, with the Lo: Rivers, Gray, and Vaughan, prisoners.' '19'Enter the Lords to Council.' '20'Enter Duke of Gloucester and Buckingham in armour.' '21'Enter Catesby with Hast. head.' '22'Enter a Scrivener with a paper in his hand.' '23'Enter Rich. with two Bishops aloft.' '24'Enter Quee. Mother . . . at one door, Duchess of Gloucester. at another door.' '25The trumpets sound, Enter Richard crowned . . . with other Nobles. . . .26Here he ascendeth the throne. . . .27'He whispers in his <Tirrel's> ear.' '28'Enter Sir Francis Tirrel.' '29'Enter K. Richard marching with Drums and Trumpets. . . .30The trumpets.' '31'Enter another Messenger. . . .32'He <Richard> striketh him.' '33'Enter Buckingham to execution.' '34'*Richard starteth up out of a dream.*' '35'Enter the Lords to Richmond.' '36'*His <Richmond's> oration to his soldiers.*' '37'*The clock striketh.*' '38'*He <Norfolk> showeth him <Richard> a paper.*' '39'*His <Richard's> oration to his army.*' '40'*Alarum, Enter Richard and Richmond, they fight, Richard is slain: then retreat being sounded, Enter Richmond, Darby, bearing the crown, with other Lords, &c.*

Folio: 'Enter Richard Duke of Gloster, solus.' 'Enter Clarence, and Brakenbury, guarded.' 'Enter the corse of Henry the sixth with Halberds to guard it, Lady Anne being the mourner. . . .4Spits at him. . . .5She looks scornfully at him. . . .6He lays his breast open, she offers at it with his sword. . . .7She falls the sword.' '8'Enter the Queen Mother <error>9'Enter two Murtherers.' '10'Enter Clarence and Keeper. . . .11'Enter Brakenbury the Lieutenant.' '12'Flourish. Enter the King sick, the Queen . . . <Buckingham &c.> Embrace. . . .13They all start.' '14'Enter the old Duchess of York, with the two Children of Clarence.' '15'Enter the Queen with her hair about her ears, Rivers and Dorset after her.' '16'Enter Archbishop17'*The trumpets sound. Enter young Prince . . . Lord Cardinal, with others.*' '18'*A sennet. Exeunt Prince . . . Manet Richard < &c. > . . .*' '19'Enter a Messenger to the door of Hastings. . . .20'Enter a Pursuivant. . . .21Throws him his purse.' '22'Enter Sir Richard Ratcliff, with Halberds, carrying the Nobles to death at Pomfret.' '23'Enter Buckingham . . . with others, at a table.' '24'Enter Richard, and Buckingham, in rotten armour,

marvellous ill-favoured.' 21'Enter Lovell and Ratcliff, with Hastings' head.' 22'Enter a Scrivener.' 23'Enter Richard aloft, between two Bishops.' 24'Enter the Queen, Anne Duchess of Gloucester . . . ' 25'Sound a sennet. Enter Richard in pomp . . . 26'Sound . . . 27'Whispers.' 28'Enter Tyrrel.' 29'Enter King Richard, and his train. . . . 30'Flourish. Alarums.' 31'Enter another Messenger. . . . 32'He striketh him.' 33'Enter Buckingham with Halberds, led to execution.' *'They <Richmond &c.> withdraw into the tent.' *'<Richmond> Sleeps.' 34'Richard starts out of his dream.' 35'Enter the Lords to Richmond sitting in his tent.' 36'His <Richmond's> oration to his soldiers.' 37'Clock strikes.' *'Drum afar off.' *'Enter a Messenger.' 38'Alarum, Enter Richard and Richmond, they fight, Richard is slain. Retreat, and flourish. Enter Richmond, Derby bearing the crown, with divers other Lords.'

In Q there is not much that is descriptive. The directions are generally bare, several are vague, some inadequate. In 7 the Murderers appear as Executioners because Richard so refers to them in the text.

Since F was set up from Q there are naturally directions in common, but they are fewer than might have been expected. There is little in Q that is not in F, and most of it may be due to accidental omission (obviously in Richard's oration, probably in 22). Some minor differences may be due to the folio editor (e.g. 34, 38), but the majority seem to derive from the manuscript. Most of the picturesque details are additions in F. Some additions in passages printed from Q3 must be due to the book-keeper, and he doubtless made similar notes elsewhere. F is usually specific where Q is vague—except in 18, and this is not actually indefinite. It has no really loose directions, as Q has in 19. On the other hand several entrances are incomplete. It is curious that the term Queen Mother is used wrongly by F in 6 and rightly by Q in 24.

King Lear (p. 88)

The descriptive character of the directions in Q, though clear, is not very pronounced. They are generally short and often inadequate. F adds many notes for noises and necessary action. Again I give Q first.

Quarto: 1'Enter Kent, Gloster, and Bastard.' 2'Sound a sennet, Enter one bearing a coronet, then Lear, then the Dukes of Albany and Cornwall, next Gonoril, Regan, Cordelia, with followers.' 3'Enter Lear.' 4'Enter Lear.' 5'Enter Edmund with his rapier drawn, Gloster, the Duke and Duchess.' *'<Kent> Sleeps.' 6'Enter Gloster and the Bastard with lights.' 7'Enter Gloster.' 8'Enter Gloster and Lear, Kent, Fool, and Tom.' 9'Enter Gloster brought in by two or

three. . . . *〈Cornwall and Servant〉 Draw and fight. . . . ¹⁰She 〈Regan〉 takes a sword and runs at him 〈Servant〉 behind.' ¹¹'Enter Lear mad.' ¹²'Enter three Gentlemen.' *'They 〈Edgar and Oswald〉 fight. . . . He 〈Oswald〉 dies.' ¹³'Alarum. Enter the powers of France over the stage, Cordelia with her Father in her hand.' ¹⁴'Enter Edmund, with Lear and Cordelia prisoners.' ¹⁵'Enter Edgar at the third sound, a Trumpet before him.' ¹⁶'Enter one with a bloody knife. . . . ¹⁷The bodies of Gonoril and Regan are brought in.' ¹⁸'Enter Lear with Cordelia in his arms.'

Folio: 'Enter Kent, Gloucester, and Edmond.' ²'Sennet. Enter King Lear, Cornwall, Albany, Goneril, Regan, Cordelia, and Attendants.' ³'Horns within. Enter Lear and Attendants.' ⁴'Enter Lear, Kent, Gentleman, and Fool.' ⁵'Enter Bastard, Cornwall, Regan, Gloster, Servants.' *'Stocks brought out.' *'Kent here set at liberty.' *'Storm and tempest.' ⁶'Enter Gloster, and Edmund.' ⁷'Enter Gloucester, with a torch.' ⁸'Enter Kent, and Gloucester. . . . Enter Lear, Edgar, and Fool.' ⁹'Enter Gloucester, and Servants. . . . ¹⁰Kills him.' ¹¹'Enter Lear.' ¹²'Enter a Gentleman.' *'Enter Lear in a chair carried by Servants.' ¹³'Alarum within. Enter with Drum and Colours, Lear, Cordelia, and Soldiers, over the stage, and exeunt.' ¹⁴'Enter in conquest with Drum and Colours, Edmund, Lear and Cordelia, as prisoners, Soldiers, Captain.' ¹⁵'1 trumpet. . . . 2 trumpet. . . . 3 trumpet. Trumpet answers within. Enter Edgar armed.' ¹⁶'Enter a Gentleman. . . . ¹⁷Goneril and Regan's bodies brought out.' ¹⁸'Enter Lear with Cordelia in his arms.' *'He 〈Lear〉 dies.' *'Exeunt with a dead march.'

Othello (p. 108)

A few instances will suffice to make clear the relation between the directions in the two texts.

Folio: 'Enter Roderigo and Iago.' ²'〈Brabantio〉 Above.' ³'Enter Brabantio, with Servants and torches.' ⁴'Enter Duke, Senators, and Officers.' ⁵'Enter Montano, and two Gentlemen. . . . Enter a Gentleman.' ⁶'Enter Othello's Herald, with a proclamation.' ⁷'Enter Cassio pursuing Roderigo.' ⁸'〈Othello〉 Falls in a trance.' ⁹'Enter Othello, and Desdemona in her bed. . . . ¹⁰Smother's her. Æmilia at the door. . . . ¹¹Enter Lodovico, Cassio, Montano, and Iago, with Officers. . . . ¹²'〈Othello〉 Dies.'

Quarto: 'Enter Iago and Roderigo.' ²'Brabantio at a window.' ³'Enter Brabantio in his night gown, and Servants with torches.' ⁴'Enter Duke and Senators, set at a table with lights and Attendants.' ⁵'Enter Montanio, Governor of Cypres, with two other Gentlemen. . . . Enter a third Gentleman.' *'Enter a Messenger. . . . A shot.

. . . Trumpets within. . . They <Othello and Desdemona> kiss.' 6'Enter a Gentleman reading a proclamation.' 7'Enter Cassio, driving in Roderigo.' *'He <Othello> kneels. . . Iago kneels.' 8'He <Othello> falls down.' *'A trumpet.' 9'Enter Othello with a light. . . *He kisses her <Desdemona>. . . 10He stifles her. Emillia calls within. . . *She dies. . . *Oth. falls on the bed. . . *The Moor runs at Iago. Iago kills his wife. . . 11Enter Lodovico, Montano, Iago, and Officers. Cassio in a chair. . . *He <Othello> stabs himself. . . 12He dies.'

Troilus and Cressida (p. 111)

The directions in the two texts have a common basis, and their relation can best be shown in a single list, the folio expansions and variants being enclosed within brackets in roman and italic respectively.

'Enter Cressid and her man.' ['Enter common Soldiers.'] ['[Sennet.] Enter Agamemnon . . . with others.' ['Tucket.']] ['<Ajax> Strikes him <Thersites>.'] 'Enter Cassandra raving [*with her hair about her ears*].' 'Exeunt. [Music sounds within.] Enter Pandarus [and a Servant].' ['[Enter] Achilles and Patroclus stand [*om.*] in their tent.' ['Enter the Greeks <viz. Diomed>'].'] ['Sound trumpet.']] 'Flourish [*om.*] enter all of Troy[, Hector . . . and Attendants. Flourish.]] 'Alarum. . . Trumpets cease.' ['Enter Agamemnon and the rest <i.e. they come forward?>'].'] ['A larum.]] Exeunt. Enter Thersites: excursions [*in excursion*].'] 'Enter one in armour.' 'Exeunt. [Sound retreat. Shout.] Enter Agam[emnon]. . . and the rest marching.'

Several of the folio directions are marked rather early, but so are some in the quarto. Two of the additional directions in F are apparently incorrect as they stand, and most of them are curiously vague. In F the expansion of 'all of Troy' causes duplication: 'with her hair about her ears' (which it substitutes for 'raving') is almost a technical term (cf. *Richard III*, F 11). In Q 'Achilles and Patro stand in their tent' is borrowed from the text ('Achilles stands i'th' entrance of his tent'). In this direction the names are in roman in both texts, which is exceptional and suggests the dependence of F on Q.

2 *Henry IV* (p. 114)

Comparison of the directions is particularly interesting in this play.

Quarto: 1'Enter Rumour painted full of tongues.' 2'Enter the Lord Bardolfe at one door.' 3'Enter Sir John alone, with his Page bearing his sword and buckler.' 4'Enter th' Archbishop, Thomas Mowbray (Earl Marshal), the Lord Hastings, Fauconbridge, and Bardolfe.' 5'Enter Hostess of the tavern, and an Officer or two.' *'Exit Hostess

and Sergeant <misplaced>.’ ‘Enter the Prince, Poins, Sir John Russell <a ghost?>, with other. . . .’ ‘Enter Bardolfe and Boy. . . . Exeunt.’ ‘Enter Northumberland <and> his Wife, and the Wife to Harry Percy. . . . Exeunt.’ ‘Enter a Drawer or two. . . . *Enter Will <a ghost>.’ ‘Enter Ancient Pistol, and Bardolfe’s Boy (= Bardolph and his Boy).’ ‘Enter Prince and Poins.’ ‘Peyto knocks at door.’ ‘Enter the King in his night gown alone.’ ‘Enter Justice Shallow, and Justice Silence.’ ‘Enter Bardolfe, and one with him.’ ‘*(<Sir> John pricks him <Mouldy>).’ ‘Enter the Archbishop, Mowbray, Bardolfe, Hastings, within the forest of Gaultree. . . .’ ‘Enter Westmorland.’ ‘Enter Prince John and his army <misplaced>.’ ‘Alarum. Enter Falstaff. Excursions.’ ‘Enter John, Westmorland, and the rest. Retreat.’ ‘Enter Shallow, Falstaff, and Bardolfe <misplaced>.’ ‘Enter Warwick, Duke Humphrey, L. Chief Justice, Thomas Clarence, Prince John, Westmorland. . . .’ ‘Enter John, Thomas, and Humphrey.’ ‘Enter Sir John, Shallow, Scilens, Davy, Bardolfe, Page. . . .’ ‘One knocks at door. . . .’ ‘Enter Pistol.’ ‘Enter Sincklo and three or four Officers.’ ‘Enter Strewers of rushes. . . .’ ‘Trumpets sound, and the King, and his train pass over the stage: after them enter Falstaff, Shallow, Pistol, Bardolfe, and the Boy. . . .’ ‘Enter the King and his train. . . .’ ‘Enter Justice and Prince John. . . .’ ‘Exeunt <Pistol &c.: misplaced>.’

Folio: ‘Enter Rumour.’ ‘Enter Lord Bardolfe, and the Porter.’ ‘Enter Falstaff, and Page.’ ‘Enter Archbishop, Hastings, Mowbray, and Lord Bardolfe.’ ‘Enter Hostess, with two officers, Fang, and Snare.’ ‘Enter M. Gower.’ ‘Enter Prince Henry, Poins, Bardolfe, and Page. . . .’ ‘Enter Bardolfe. . . . Exeunt.’ ‘Enter Northumberland <and> his Lady, and Harry Percy’s Lady. . . . Exeunt.’ ‘Enter two Drawers.’ ‘Enter Pistol, and Bardolph and his Boy.’ ‘Enter the Prince and Poins disguised.’ ‘Enter Peto.’ ‘Enter the King, with a Page.’ ‘Enter Shallow and Silence: with Mouldy, Shadow, Wart, Feeble, Bullcalf.’ ‘Enter Bardolph and his Boy.’ ‘Enter the Archbishop, Mowbray, Hastings, Westmorland, Colville. . . .’ ‘Enter Westmorland.’ ‘Enter Prince John.’ ‘Enter Falstaff and Colville.’ ‘Enter Prince John, and Westmorland.’ ‘Exit <Blunt> with Colville.’ ‘Enter Shallow, Silence, Falstaff, Bardolfe, Page, and Davy.’ ‘Enter the Earl of Warwick and the Lord Chief Justice. . . .’ ‘Enter John of Lancaster, Gloucester, and Clarence.’ ‘Enter Falstaff, Shallow, Silence, Bardolfe, Page, and Pistol. . . .’ ‘Enter Pistol.’ ‘Enter Hostess Quickly, Doll Tearsheet, and Beadles.’ ‘Enter two Grooms. . . .’ ‘Enter Falstaff, Shallow, Pistol, Bardolfe, and Page. . . .’ ‘The trumpets sound. Enter King Henry the Fifth, Brothers, Lord Chief Justice. . . .’ ‘Exit King. . . .’ ‘Exit <Pistol &c.>. Manet Lancaster and Chief Justice.’

The quarto affords a beautiful study of an author's directions. He jots down hastily, with such graphic details as take his fancy, a list of the characters he thinks he may need in a scene. Sometimes he introduces others, fails to make use of those he has, or decides that some had better come in later (as in 22): he never thinks to go back and correct his original heading. Some characters, like Sir John Russell in 6 and Will in an entry peculiar to Q, are ghosts—unless Russell and Peto are the same. The position of the directions is most erratic: 18 appears two lines before the end of the previous scene, 21 in the margin opposite the end of the previous act, no division being marked. Notes for noises off have clearly been added to 19 and 20 (as shown by spaces after 'Alarum' and before 'Excursions' and 'Retreat') presumably by the book-keeper when he read through the manuscript.

The folio presents a striking contrast, the directions being severely edited and reduced to the bare necessities of the stage, though the retention of a slight error in 8 suggests dependence on Q. An error in 10 is corrected. The positions of all have been carefully defined. It is perhaps remarkable that the book-keeper's notes have disappeared. So naturally have the descriptive touches, though a solitary one has been added in 11. Q's massed entry in 22 has been resolved, but curiously enough minor duplications have been introduced at 6-7, 16-17, 24-5. The first of these is due to erroneously equating Russell and Bardolph.

Titus Andronicus (p. 117)

The following are typical directions. All verbal differences in the folio are indicated by square brackets.

'[Flourish.] Enter the Tribunes and Senators aloft: And then enter Saturninus and his Followers at one door, and Bassianus and his Followers [at the other], with Drums and Trumpets [*Drum and Colours*].' '[Enter] Marcus Andronicus [aloft] with the crown.' 'Sound drums and trumpets, and [. *And*] then enter two of Titus' Sons, and then [; *After them*,] two Men bearing a coffin covered with black, then two other Sons, then [. *After them*,] Titus Andronicus, and then Tamora the Queen of Goths and her two sons Chiron and Demetrius, with Aaron the Moor, and others as many as can be, then [: *They*] set down the coffin, and Titus speaks.' '[A long flourish till they <Saturninus &c.> come down.]' 'Exeunt. [Actus Secunda. <*sic*>] Sound trumpets, [*Flourish*.] manet Moor. [*Enter Aaron alone*.]' 'Enter Titus Andronicus, and his three Sons, making a noise with hounds and horns [, and Marcus].' '[Wind horns.] Here a cry of hounds, and wind horns in a peale: then enter . . .' 'Enter the Empress' Sons with

Lavinia, her hands cut off, and her tongue cut out, and ravished.' 'Enter the Judges and Senators with Titus' two Sons bound, passing on the stage to the place of execution, and Titus going before pleading. . . . Andronicus lieth down, and the Judges pass by him.' 'Enter Lucius' Son [*young Lucius*] and Lavinia running after him, and the boy flies from her with his books under his arm. [Enter Titus and Marcus.] 'They knock and Titus opens his study door.' 'Trumpets sounding, [*Hautboys*. A table brought in.] Enter Titus like a cook, placing the dishes [Q2, F *placing the meat on the table*], and Lavinia with a veil over her face.'

It is clear that the folio alterations are for the most part due to the editor or compositor, the additions to the book-keeper. The duplication of 'Wind horns' suggests that the latter wrote his notes in the margin.

Richard II (p. 120)

The *Quarto* directions are clearly the author's, and are full of graphic touches, while at the same time quite inadequate for production. There is a good deal of inconsistency in the names. '1Enter Bullingbrook and Mowbray.' '2The trumpets sound and the King enters with his Nobles, when they are set, enter the Duke of Norfolk <= Mowbray> in arms defendant. . . . '3The trumpets sound. Enter Duke of Hereford <= Bullingbrook> appellant in armour.' '4Enter the King with Bushy, &c. at one door, and the Lord Aumerle at another. . . . Enter Bushy with news <duplication>.' '5Enter Earl of Salisbury and a Welsh Captain.' '6Enter the King . . . '7Enter Bull. York, North. . . . '8The trumpets sound, Richard appeareth on the walls. . . . *He <Bullingbrook> kneels down.' '9Enter the Queen with her Attendants. . . . Enter Gardeners.' '10Enter Bullingbrook with the Lords to Parliament. . . . Enter Bagot.' '11He <York> plucks it <a paper> out of his <Aumerle's> bosom and reads it. . . . His <York's> Man enters with his boots.' '12Enter the King <Henry> with his Nobles. . . . Enter Aumerle amazed. . . . '13The Duke of York knocks at the door and crieth.' '14Exeunt <King Henry &c.>. Manet Sir Pierce Exton, &c. <viz. his Man>' '15The Murderers rush in. . . . '16Here Exton strikes him down.'

The *Folio* directions are shorn of all such superfluities as titles: there are no graphic details. On the other hand they add a large number of necessary entrances, define numbers, and partly remove inconsistency in the use of names. They also supply some notes for noises, and occasionally for action. '1Enter Bullingbrook and Mowbray.' '2Flourish. Enter King, Gaunt, Bushy, Bagot, Green, and others: Then

Mowbray in armour, and Herald. . . .³Tucket. Enter Hereford (= Bullingbrook), and Herald.' ⁴'Enter King, Aumerle, Green, and Bagot. . . . Enter Bushy.' ⁵'Enter Salisbury, and a Captain.' ⁶'Drums: flourish, and Colours. Enter Richard . . . ' ⁷'Enter with Drum and Colours, Bullingbrook, York, Northumberland, Attendants. . . . Parle without, and answer within: then a flourish. Enter on the walls, Richard, Carlisle, Aumerle, Scroop, Salisbury.' ⁹'Enter the Queen, and two Ladies. . . . Enter a Gardener, and two Servants.' ¹⁰'Enter as to the Parliament, Bullingbrook, Aumerle, Northumberland, Percy, Fitz-Water, Surrey, Carlisle, Abbot of Westminster. Herald, Officers, and Bagot.' ¹¹'Enter one with a glass.' ¹²'Enter Bullingbrook, Percy, and other Lords. . . . Enter Aumerle. . . .¹³York within. . . . *Enter York. . . . *Duchess within. . . . *Enter Duchess.' ¹⁴'Exeunt (Bullingbrook &c.). Enter Exton and Servants (but no new scene).' ¹⁵'Enter Exton and Servants. . . .¹⁶Exton strikes him down.'

Much Ado about Nothing (p. 121)

The following are typical directions in Q, including all those in which there are significant variants in F (these are indicated by square brackets).

'Enter Leonato Governor of Messina, Innogen his wife, Hero his daughter, and Beatrice his niece, with a Messenger.' 'Enter Leonato and an old man Brother to Leonato.' 'Enter Sir John the bastard, and Conrade his companion.' 'Enter Leonato, his Brother, his Wife . . . and a Kinsman.' 'Enter Prince . . . and Balthaser, or dumb John (<? read Bor(achio), Don John>[, Maskers with a Drum]. . . . [Music for the] Dance.' 'Enter the Prince, Hero, Leonato, John and Borachio, and Conrade [*om. all after Prince*]. . . . Enter Claudio and Beatrice [, Leonato, Hero].' 'Enter Prince, Leonato, Claudio, Music [*Claudio, and Jack Wilson*]. . . . Enter Balthaser with music [*om.*]. . . . [Exeunt <all but Benedick>.]' 'Enter Hero and two gentlewomen [*gentlemen*], Margaret and Ursley [*Ursula*].' '[Exit <Don John &c>]. . . . Enter Dogberry and his Copartner (= Verges) with the Watch.' 'Enter Leonato, and the Constable (= Dogberry), and the Headborough (= Verges).' 'Enter Prince, Bastard (= Don John) . . . ' 'Enter the Constables, Borachio, <and Conrade> and the Town Clerk in gowns.' 'Enter Leonato, his Brother, and the Sexton [*om. all after Leonato*] . . . [Exeunt <Constables: misplaced>.]' 'Enter Claudio, Prince, and three or four with tapers.' 'Enter Prince and Claudio, and two or three other [*Claudio, with Attendants*].' (At several points F marks an entrance a couple of lines earlier than Q.)

The Merchant of Venice (p. 123)

Besides those quoted in the text the following directions of Q are of interest: additions and alterations in F are scanty.

'Enter Portia with her waiting woman Nerrissa.' 'Enter Bassiano with Shylock the Jew.' 'Enter old Gobbo with a basket.' 'Enter Bassiano with a follower or two.' 'Enter the maskers, Gratiano and Salerino [*Salino*]. . . Jessica above.' 'Enter Portia with Morrocho and both their trains.' 'Enter Nerrissa and a Serviture. . . Enter Arragon, his train, and Portia. [Flor. cornets.]' 'Enter a man from Antonio. . . Enter Tubal. . . Enter Tubal <error> [*om.*].' 'Enter Lorenzo, Jessica, and Salerio a messenger from Venice [*om. all after Salerio*]. . . Open[s] the letter.' 'Enter the Jew, and Salerio [*Solanio*], and Antonio, and the Jailor.' 'Enter Portia . . . and a man of Portia's.' 'Enter Portia for Balthazer.' 'Enter [Portia and] Nerrissa.'

A Midsummer-Night's Dream (p. 124)

The principal directions in Q, with the variants in F, are as follows:

'Enter Theseus, Hippolita, with others. . . Enter Egeus and his daughter Hermia, and Lysander and Helena, and Demetrius [, *Lysander, and Demetrius* <correctly>]. . . Exeunt. [Manet Lysander and Hermia.]' 'Enter Quince, the carpenter; and Snug, the joiner; and Bottom, the weaver; and Flute, the bellows-mender; and Snout, the tinker; and Starveling the tailor [*om. superfluous and's*].' '¶ [*om.*] Enter a Fairy at one door, and Robin Goodfellow at another. . . Enter the King of Fairies, at one door, with his train; and the Queen, at another, with hers.' 'Enter Demetrius, Helena following him.' 'Enter Titania Queen of Fairies, with her train [*om. Titania*]. . . Fairies sing. . . [She sleeps.] Enter Oberon. . . Enter Lysander: and Hermia. . . [They sleep.] Enter Puck. . . Enter Demetrius and Helena running. [. . . Exit Demetrius.]' 'Enter the Clowns. . . [Enter Puck. <error> . . .] Enter Robin. . . [The Clowns all exit. . . Enter Piramus with the ass head. . .] Enter [Peter] Quince. . . Enter [Peaseblossom, Cobweb, Moth, Mustardseed, and <error>] four Fairies.' 'Enter King of Fairies, and Robin Goodfellow [*Pharies, solus*]. . . Enter Puck. . . Lie down. . . [Exit Lysander and Demetrius. . .] Exeunt [*om.*]. [Enter Oberon and Puck. . . Shifting places. . . Lie down. . . They sleep all the act.]' 'Enter Queen of Fairies, and Clown, and Fairies: and the King behind them. . . [Music tongs, rural music. . . Music still. . . Sleepers lie still. . .] Enter Theseus[, Egeus, Hippolita,] and all his train. Wind horn[s]. . . [Horns and they wake.] Shout within: they all start up. Wind horns [*om.*]. [. . . Bottom wakes. Exit Lovers.]' 'Enter Quince, Flute, Thisby and the rabble [*Thisby,*

Snout, and Starveling]. 'Enter Theseus, Hippolita, and Philostrate [*and Egeus and his Lords*]. . . . Enter Lovers; Lysander, Demetrius, Hermia, and Helena. . . . [Flor. trum.] Enter the Prologue. [Quince.] . . . [Tawyer with a trumpet before them.] Enter Pyramus . . . [. . . Exit all but Wall. <duplicating> . . .] Exit Lion, Thisby, and Moonshine. . . . Enter Thisby.[. . . The Lion roars, Thisby runs off. . . . Enter Thisby.] 'Enter King and Queen of Fairies, with all their train [*om. all*]. [. . . The song.]' (F adds other necessary entrances and exits.)

Love's Labour's Lost (p. 126)

A few directions from Q will serve as examples: 'Enter a Constable with Costard with a letter.' 'Enter Armado and Moth his page.' 'Enter Clown, Constable, and Wench <prefix 'Maid' = Jaquenetta>.' 'Enter the Princess of France, with three attending Ladies and three Lords.' 'Enter Braggart and his Boy.' 'Shout within.' 'Enter Berown with a paper in his hand, alone. . . . He stands aside. The King entereth. . . . Enter Longaville. The King steps aside. . . . He <Longaville> reads the sonnet.' 'Draw out his table-book.' 'Enter the Ladies.' 'Enter Black-moors with music, the Boy with a speech, and the rest of the Lords disguised.' 'Enter the King and the rest.' 'Enter Pompey <played by Clown>. . . . Enter Curate for Alexander. . . . Enter Pedant for Judas, and the Boy for Hercules. . . . Berown steps forth. . . . Enter a messenger Monsieur Marcade. . . . Exeunt Worthies. . . . Enter all <the performers>.'

1 *Henry IV* (p. 128)

The most distinctive directions in Q, with the differences in F, are as follows:

'Enter [Henry] Prince of Wales, and [*om.*] Sir John Falstaff[, and Poin]. . . . Enter Poin [*om.*].' 'Enter a Carrier with a lantern in his hand. . . . Enter another Carrier.' 'Enter Prince, Poin, and Peto, &c. [*om. &c.*] . . . They whistle. . . . Enter the travellers [*om. the*]. . . . Here they rob them and bind them. Exeunt [*om.*]. Enter the Prince and Poin. . . . Enter the thieves again [*om. the*]. . . . As they are sharing the Prince and Poin set upon them, they all run away, and Falstaff after a blow or two runs away too, leaving the booty behind them [*om. and . . . too*].' 'Enter Hotspur solus reading a letter. . . . Enter his Lady.' 'Here they <the Prince and Poin> both call him, the Drawer stands amazed not knowing which way to go. Enter Vintner. . . . He <Falstaff> drinketh [*om.*]. . . . Enter Hostess. . . . Enter Bardoll running. . . . He <Peto> searcheth his <Falstaff's> pocket[s], and findeth certain papers.' 'Enter Glendower with the Ladies. . . . Glendower speaks to her <Lady Mortimer> in

Welsh, and she answers him in the same. . . . The Lady <Mortimer> speaks again in Welsh. . . . Here the Lady sings a Welsh song.' 'Enter the King, Prince of Wales, and others. . . . Exeunt Lords.' 'Enter Falstaff and Bardoll. . . . Enter the Prince marching, and Falstaff meets him playing upon his truncheon like a fife.' '[Exeunt omnes. Actus Quartus. Scena Prima. Enter Harry Hotspur, Worcester, and Douglas. . . .] Enter one with letters [*a Messenger*].' 'The trumpet sounds a parley.' 'Exeunt: manent [. *Manet*] Prince, Falst. [*and Falstaff*].' 'Enter Percy. [*Enter Hotspur*. <two lines later>]' 'Here [*om.*] they embrace, the trumpets sound, the King enters [*entereth*] with his power, alarm to [*unto*] the battle, then [. *Then*] enter Douglas, and Sir Walter Blunt. . . . They fight, Douglas kills Blunt [*Fight, Blunt is slain*], then enter[s] Hotspur. . . . [Exeunt.] Alarm, [and] Enter Falstaff solus. . . . The Prince draws it out, and finds it to be a [*draws out a*] bottle of sack. . . . He throws the bottle [*Throws it*] at him.' '[Enter Douglas. . . .] They fight, the King [*K.*] being in danger, Enter Prince of Wales [*Prince*]. . . . Enter Douglas, he fighteth [*fight*s] with Falstaff, he [*who*] falls down as if he were dead, the Prince killeth Percy. . . . He spieth Falstaff on the ground [*om.*]. . . . He <Falstaff> takes up [*Takes*] Hotspur on his back. . . . A retreat is sounded.' 'The trumpets sound. Enter the King . . . with Worcester and Vernon prisoners. [. . . Exit Worcester and Vernon.]' (F adds several other necessary exits: it has consistently the forms 'Bardolph' and 'Alarum'.)

ADDENDA

Page xxxiv. The prompter's or press reader's objection to the word 'rash' may have been not so much on the score of unfamiliarity (for it remained in literary use throughout the seventeenth century), as on account of the repeated sibilants in 'flesh rash boarish'.

Page liv. I ought perhaps to have explained that the classical editor enjoys and usually claims the same general freedom as the modernizing editor in English. He may, of course, allow to some particular source whatever preponderance of authority he pleases, but he is not tied to it as a copy-text unless he proposes to reproduce its accidents as well as its readings. It is only to the critical editing of works in English (or of course in any language where the philological position is similar) that the conception of a copy-text properly applies. It is, as I tried to explain, not quite the same as that of the most authoritative text. I do not know enough about classical texts and editing to say how far or in what instances the notion of a single preponderant authority still finds favour. But when Housman in the introduction to his Manilius made his famous assault upon the ineluctable authority of the 'best' manuscript, he was merely stating what is in general obvious. Whether an original reading can survive only in what is generally an inferior tradition depends entirely upon the genetic relationship of the manuscripts, a matter concerning which Housman was less explicit than one could wish. It may be manifestly impossible; on the other hand there may be nothing whatever against it.

Page 12, note 1. A generation later than *The Spanish Tragedy* conditions may have altered. A pirated text of William Alabaster's Latin play *Roxana* was regularly entered under the hand of Sir Henry Herbert and printed in 1632, but was superseded the same year by an authorized edition issued by a different publisher.

Page 15, note 1. Since this note was in type Professor C. J. Sisson has published his evidence on the subject in an article on 'Shakespeare Quartos as Prompt-Copies' in *R.E.S.*, 1942, xviii. 129.

Page 84. The last instance given under *vulgarization* (III. vii. 131-2) is in fact due to recollection of l. 79, 'Take on his Grace the sovereignty thereof'.

Page 107, note 1. Herbert's licence for *acting*, dated 2 Aug. 1641, is printed at the end of Thomas Jordan's *Walks of Islington and Hogsdon*, 1657; which shows that the edition was set up from the prompt-book, and presumably that the licence was taken to cover printing, for the play was entered on 21 Apr. 1657 under the hand of the warden only: but nothing can be argued from this for the practice at an earlier date. Herbert's licence for *printing* 'a Comedy called the Leaguer', that is *Holland's Leaguer* by Shakerley Marmion, is preserved in the entry of that play in the Stationers' Register under the date 26 Jan. 1632.

Page 115. That the folio text of 2 *Henry IV* was printed from manuscript and not from the quarto has been persuasively argued by M. A. Shaaber in his careful edition of the play for the Furness Variorum (1940). In the same edition J. Q. Adams suggests that the MS. used was a transcript by Ralph Crane (cf. note 1).

Page 141. The massed entries in the Malone manuscript of *A Game at Chess* were pointed out by F. P. Wilson in his article on Crane (*The Library*, 1926, vii. 214).

In connexion with the use of 'Finis actus—' in *The Two Gentlemen* it should have been mentioned that Crane uses this formula regularly in his transcript of *The Witch*. However, he may have copied it from the original, since it is found in Middleton's autograph of *A Game at Chess* but not in *Demetrius and Enanthe*.

Page 149. The view suggested in the text has been lately elaborated in an able article on "Timon of Athens" by Miss Ellis-Fermor in *R.E.S.*, 1942, xviii. 270.

SUMMARY

Chronological Order (Chambers)

1 *Henry VI* (p. 138). H.¹

Folio: from an early author's manuscript used as a prompt-book and perhaps revised to adapt it to parts 2 and 3: divided irregularly into acts and imperfectly into scenes.

2 *Henry VI* (p. 52). H.

Bad Quarto: 1594: from a report, probably by actors. Reprints: 1600, 1619.

Folio: from manuscript, probably an early author's copy used as a prompt-book, supplemented where defective by reference to Q.

3 *Henry VI* (p. 52). H.

Bad Quarto: 1595 (octavo): from a report, probably by actors. Reprints: 1600, 1619.

Folio: from manuscript, probably an early author's copy used as a prompt-book, supplemented where defective by reference to Q.

Richard III (p. 77). H.

Doubtful Quarto: 1597: from a memorial reconstruction for the stage, perhaps made by the company in the absence of the prompt-book. Reprints: 1598, 1602, 1605, 1612, 1622.

Folio: substantially from Q 1622 corrected by comparison with a manuscript, perhaps the author's copy rather imperfectly edited and used as a prompt-book, but with two passages closely reprinted from Q 1602: divided into acts and scenes.

The Comedy of Errors (p. 140). C.

Folio: from foul papers annotated by the prompter and possibly used on the stage: divided into acts and scenes.

Titus Andronicus (p. 117). T.

Good Quarto: 1594: from foul papers containing a good deal of alteration. Reprints: 1600, 1611.

¹ The letters C, H, and T indicate of course the section of the Folio (Comedies, Histories, or Tragedies) in which the play is printed.

Folio: from Q 1611 with some revision of the stage directions and the addition of one scene from a theatrical manuscript (probably of this scene only): divided into acts.

The Taming of the Shrew (p. 72). C.

Quarto: 1594: a derivative version based on recollections or reports of Shakespeare's play. Reprints: 1596, 1607.

Folio: from manuscript, an early prompt-book that retained features of the author's original and lacked the conclusion of the framework: divided irregularly into acts.

The Two Gentlemen of Verona (p. 141). C.

Folio: from a transcript by Crane, possibly of a theatrical copy: divided into acts and scenes.

Love's Labour's Lost (p. 126). C.

[?Bad Quarto: probably a lost edition of c. 1596.]

Good Quarto: 1598: from foul papers with possibly some reference to the 'bad' quarto.

Folio: from Q 1598 with slight literary editing only: divided into acts.

Romeo and Juliet (p. 61). T.

Bad Quarto: 1597: from a report, probably by an actor who may have recently performed in a shortened version and earlier in the full play.

Good Quarto: 1599: substantially from foul papers, but in part from Q 1597 corrected by comparison with them. Reprints: 1609, n.d. (perhaps later than F).

Folio: from Q 1609.

Richard II (p. 120). H.

Good Quarto: 1597: from foul papers. Reprints: 1598^a, 1598^b, 1608 (with addition, reported), 1615.

Folio: from either Q 1598^b or Q 1615, but with the addition supplied from the prompt-book (presumably) and perhaps some correction from the same source: divided into acts and scenes.

A Midsummer-Night's Dream (p. 124). C.

Good Quarto: 1600: from a careful author's copy, possibly with duplicate endings, with signs of alteration, and annotations by the prompter. Reprint: '1600' = 1619.

Folio: from Q 1619 with reference to the prompt-book in the stage directions: divided into acts.

King John (p. 142). H.

Folio: from foul papers (in the main at least): divided irregularly into acts and scenes.

The Merchant of Venice (p. 123). C.

Good Quarto: 1600: from foul papers with some prompter's notes. Reprint: '1600' = 1619.

Folio: from Q 1600 with reference to the prompt-book in the stage directions: divided into acts.

1 *Henry IV* (p. 128). H.

Good Quarto: 1598: possibly from the author's manuscript. Reprints: 1599, 1604, 1608, 1613, 1622 (probably later than F).

Folio: from Q 1613 with slight literary editing only: divided into acts and scenes.

2 *Henry IV* (p. 114). H.

Good Quarto: 1600: from foul papers that had been cut for the stage.

Folio: possibly from a complete playhouse manuscript, but more probably from Q 1600 corrected and supplemented by comparison with it: divided into acts and scenes.

Much Ado about Nothing (p. 121). C.

Good Quarto: 1600: from foul papers.

Folio: from Q 1600 with some reference to the prompt-book: divided into acts.

Henry V (p. 68). H.

Bad Quarto: 1600: from a report, probably by actors. Reprints: 1602, '1608' = 1619.

Folio: from manuscript, foul papers: divided erroneously into acts.

Julius Caesar (p. 143). T.

Folio: from the prompt-book: divided into acts.

As you Like it (p. 144). C.

Folio: from the prompt-book: divided into acts and scenes.

Twelfth Night or What you Will (p. 144). C.

Folio: from the prompt-book: divided into acts and scenes.

Hamlet (p. 64). T.

Bad Quarto: 1603: from a report, probably by actors and perhaps embodying recollections of an earlier play.

Good Quarto: 1604-5: from foul papers. Reprints: 1611, n.d. (perhaps later than F).

Folio: from manuscript, probably a transcript of the prompt-book: two acts only marked and imperfectly divided.

The Merry Wives of Windsor (p. 70). C.

Bad Quarto: 1602: from a report, perhaps by an actor or with his assistance. Reprint: 1619.

Folio: from manuscript, a transcript by Crane probably of foul papers: divided into acts and scenes.

Troilus and Cressida (p. 111). T (doubtful).

Good Quarto: 1609: from a private transcript of foul papers, tidied up as regards the text but deficient in stage directions.

Folio: from Q 1609 corrected by comparison perhaps with the same foul papers marked for production, but more probably with a careless transcript of them.

All's Well that Ends Well (p. 145). C.

Folio: from a literary transcript of foul papers that had perhaps been annotated by the prompter: divided into acts.

Measure for Measure (p. 146). C.

Folio: from a transcript by Crane of foul papers: divided into acts and scenes.

Orhello (p. 108). T.

Good Quarto: 1622: from a private transcript of foul papers, a good deal edited in a literary sense and with some cuts: divided imperfectly into acts. (A reprint of 1630 contains the omitted passages printed from F and some readings from the same source.)

Folio: from manuscript, possibly the same foul papers tidied up, but more probably another private transcript of them: divided into acts and scenes.

King Lear (p. 88). T.

Doubtful Quarto: 1608: from a report, probably stenographic, of a performance of a somewhat cut version. Reprint: '1608' = 1619.

Folio: from Q 1608 corrected by comparison with the prompt-book, which was differently cut and slightly simplified for acting: there is an original division into acts and scenes.

Macbeth (p. 147). T.

Folio: from a prompt-book that had been a good deal altered: divided into acts and scenes.

Antony and Cleopatra (p. 147). T.

Folio: from a carefully prepared author's manuscript.

Coriolanus (p. 148). T.

Folio: from a carefully prepared author's manuscript: divided into acts.

Timon of Athens (p. 149). T.

Folio: from confused foul papers perhaps unfinished.

Cymbeline (p. 150). T (properly C).

Folio: probably from a prompt-book based on a careful author's manuscript: divided into acts and scenes.

The Winter's Tale (p. 150). C.

Folio: from a transcript by Crane, possibly of the prompt-book: divided into acts and scenes.

The Tempest (p. 151). C.

Folio: from a carefully edited transcript by Crane of the author's manuscript: divided into acts and scenes.

Henry VIII (p. 152). H.

Folio: from a fair copy of the original manuscript: divided into acts and scenes.

Pericles (p. 74). (C.)

Bad or Doubtful Quarto: 1609^a: from a report of some kind, perhaps stenographic. Reprints: 1609^b, 1611, 1619, 1630, 1635.

Folio of 1664: from Q 1635: divided into acts.

TABLE
Folio Order

Page	Title	Bad Q	Good Q ¹	Reprints ²	Source of F Text ³	Div. ⁴
	COMEDIES					
151	Tempest				MS.	A & S
141	Two Gentlemen				MS.	A & S
70	Merry Wives	1602		1619	manuscript	A & S
146	Measure for M.				MS.	A & S
140	C. of Errors				MS.	Acts
121	Much Ado		1600		Q 1600	Acts
126	Love's L.'s Lost		1598		Q 1598	Acts
124	Mids.-N.'s Dream	(?)	1600	'1600' = 1619	Q 1619	Acts
123	Merch. of Venice		1600	'1600' = 1619	Q 1600	Acts
144	As you Like it				MS.	A & S
72	Tam. of the Shrew	1594 ⁵		1596, 1607	manuscript	Acts ⁶
145	All's Well				MS.	Acts
144	Twelfth Night				MS.	A & S
150	Winter's Tale				MS.	A & S
	HISTORIES					
142	King John				MS.	A & S ⁷
120	Richard II		1597	1598 ^a , 1598 ^b , 1608, 1615	Q 1598 ^b or Q 1615 (& MS.)	A & S
128	1 Henry IV		1598	{ 1599, 1604, 1608, 1613, } 1622(?)	Q 1613	A & S

¹ Including 'doubtful' quartos. Dates of quartos used for F in italic.

² Before the printing of F. Dates of quartos used for F in italic. No 'bad' quarto was reprinted after the appearance of a 'good' one.

³ 'MS.', first appearance; 'manuscript', replacing a 'bad' quarto; 'manuscript', replacing a 'good' quarto.

⁴ Act and scene division in F. The only play divided in the quarto is *Othello*.

⁵ Derivative version.

⁶ Imperfect.

⁷ Irregular.

TABLE

189

Page	Title	Bad Q	Good Q	Reprints	Source of F Text	Div.
114 68 138 52 52 77	2 Henry IV Henry V 1 Henry VI 2 Henry VI 3 Henry VI Richard III	1600 1594 1595 ⁸	1600 1597 ⁹	1602, '1608' = 1619 1600, 1619 1600, 1619 {1598, 1602, 1605, 1612, 1622}	(?) Q 1600 (cor. by MS.) manuscript MS. manuscript manuscript {Q 1622 (cor. by MS.) & 1602 MS.	A & S Acts ⁷ A (& S) ⁷ none none A & S A & S
152	Henry VIII					A & S
	TRAGEDIES					
111 148 117 61 149 143 147 64 88 108 147 150	Troilus Coriolanus Titus Romeo Timon Julius Caesar Macbeth Hamlet King Lear Othello Antony Cymbeline	1600 1597 1603	1609 1594 1599 1604-5 1608 ⁹ 1622 ¹¹	 1600, 1611 1609, n.d.(?) 1611, n.d.(?) '1608' = 1619	Q 1609 (cor. by MS.) MS. Q 1611 (& MS.) Q 1609 MS. MS. MS. <i>manuscript</i> Q 1608 (cor. by MS.) <i>manuscript</i> MS. MS.	none Acts Acts none none Acts A & S A & S ¹⁰ A & S A & S none A & S
74	Pericles	1609 ¹²		{1609 ^b , 1611, 1619, 1630, 1635}	F 1664: from Q 1635	Acts

⁷ Irregular. ⁸ Actually an octavo. ⁹ A 'doubtful' quarto. ¹⁰ Very imperfect. ¹¹ Division into acts, imperfect.

¹² Perhaps a 'doubtful' quarto.

INDEX

INCLUDING SOME BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AND GLOSSARIAL ENTRIES

- Superior numerals refer to footnotes. In Shakespeare's plays the main references immediately follow the title.
- abridgement, two types of, 56; reported by an actor who had also played in the full version, 64.
- accidental characteristics (i.e. spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and line division), note on, 1; their preservation binds a critical editor to a copy-text, liii.
- 'act' = interval, 125.
- act and scene division: the one conventional, the other structural, 35; in extant prompt-books, only gradually introduced, 35-6; division into scenes only, 35¹; English and Continental systems, 137; division points to theatrical origin of a manuscript, 139; *Othello* the only quarto divided (acts), 109; division original in *Lear*, 96; original division upset by revision in 1 *Hen. VI*, 139, by cutting in *K. John*, 142; division theatrical in *Two Gent.*, 141, and *Twelfth N.*, 145, theatrical or editorial in *Errors*, 140-1, editorial in 1 *Hen. IV*, 129, erroneous in *Hen. V*, 69, imperfect in *Hamlet*, 65²; imperfect and irregular division into acts only in *Shrew*, 73.
- Act to restrain abuses of players, 88¹.
- acting licences by the Master of the Revels, 24, 24¹, 30, 32-3, 41-2, 96³, 106-7, 110², 112¹, 135, 150, 182.
- actors: reporting by, in 2, 3 *Hen. VI*, 60, in *M.W.W.*, 60, 71, in *Romeo*, 64, in *Hamlet*, 66, in *Hen. V*, 69; their supposed reluctance to multiply copies of their plays, 43.
- actors' corrections, xl.
- actors' gag, 56.
- actors' names in plays, 39; may be due to author or added by book-keeper, 40; may afford evidence of revival, 41; in 2, 3 *Hen. VI*, 55, in *Romeo*, 62, in *Hen. V*, 70, in *Shrew*, 72-3, in 2 *Hen. IV*, 116, in *Much Ado* Q and F, 122, in *M.N.D.*, 125, in *Two Noble Kinsmen*, 152.
- actors' parts, 45; contain stage directions, 46, 136; their supposed use for 'assembled' texts, 134, 141, 151, and for piracies of *Romeo*, 62, of *Hamlet*, 67, of *Hen. V*, 70.
- Adams, Joseph Quincy, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, 107¹; Introduction to facsimile of *Titus Andronicus* Q1, 118²; *The 'Massacre at Paris' Leaf*, 28¹; *The Quarto of 'King Lear' and Shorthand*, 96; 182.
- additions: in prompt-books, 41; in the manuscript, 142, 144; in the margin, 61², 125, 164-5; on slips, 41, 123; in reprints of *Othello* (Q2), 111, of *Rich. II* (Q4 and F), 120, of *Titus* (F), 119; dumb show in *Cymb.* added in the playhouse, 150.
- 'after them (him)', 144; 'after all', 149.
- Aglaure*, by J. Suckling, 23¹, 45.
- 'alapt', misprint for 'ataxt', 98.
- Alcazar*, see *Battle of Alcazar*.
- Alexander, Peter, argues that *The Contention and True Tragedy* are reported texts, 52, and that *A Shrew* is derivative, 73; *Shakespeare's 'Henry VI' and 'Richard III'*, 52, 60, 73; *Troilus and Cressida*, 1609, 112¹.
- All's Well that Ends Well*, 145.
- Alleyn, Edward, preserves Henslowe's papers, 27; a play read to him, 27; his part in *Orlando* corrected in his own hand, 46.
- alterations (dramatic), attested in records, 41; in extant prompt-books, 40-2; of the names of characters, in *Hamlet*, 66, in *M.W.W.*, 72, in *Hen. IV*, 132¹, in 2 *Hen. IV*, 115; for the stage in 2 *Hen. IV*, 115-17; of a singer in *Twelfth N.*, 145; by folio editor in *L.L.L.*, 128; in proof in *Titus*, 117; in course of printing, xlvii-1, in *Lear*, 97, in 2 *Hen. IV*, 115, possibly

- in *Rich. III*, 87⁴; in course of composition *versus* in revision, *see* individual plays *passim*.
- alterations (editorial), when permissible in a critical edition, xi.
- alternative endings, in *M.W.W.*, 72; in *M.N.D.*, 124.
- alternative readings in author's manuscript, 109.
- amalgamation of parts in *Lear*, xxxiii, 100¹.
- ambiguity of 'derivation', xiv.
- ambiguity of prefixes, a source of confusion between characters, in *Rich. III*, 81², in *An Humorous Day's Mirth*, 105¹, in *Much Ado*, 122¹, in *M. of V.*, 123.
- 'anatomy' = skeleton, 116, 140¹; and *see* J. Sincklo.
- 'Andrew' = ? Merry-Andrew, clown, 122¹.
- anticipation, in reporting, 83, 90; of entrances, 38, 85², 143¹.
- Antony and Cleopatra*, 147; double entrance of, 20.
- Arcadia*, by Sir Philip Sidney (1593, fol. 8, ll. 2-3), 92¹.
- Ariosto, Lodovico, *Gli Suppositi*, 73.
- Armin, Robert, *A Nest of Ninnies*, 1608, *The Italian Tailor*, 1609, 100.
- As you Like it*, 144.
- Ashley (or Astley), Sir John, Master of the Revels, plays licensed by him entered in the Stationers' Register, 106².
- Aspects of Shakespeare*, British Academy Lectures, 2¹, 40³, 67², 75¹.
- 'assembled' texts, theory of, 134; applied to *Errors*, 141, to *Two Gent.* and *M.W.W.*, 141, to *Winter's T.*, 151, to *A Game at Chess*, 137².
- assimilation in reporting, 83, 90, 92.
- 'astringer' = ? austringer, keeper of goshawks, 145.
- 'auditory' errors, *see* mishearing.
- author, characteristics of his stage directions, 36; may demand properties, 37.
- author's corrections and revisions in reprint, xl; alone fully authoritative, but difficult to establish, xlii; admission into critical edition, xlv.
- author's errors, treatment of, xi².
- author's manuscripts, *see* individual plays *passim*.
- authoritative edition, xii; always substantive, xiii, xxi.
- authoritative reading (McKerrow), xiv¹.
- authoritative text, the conception distinguishable from that of the copy-text, liii-liv, 182.
- authority, conception of, xii; only absolute in single line of descent, xii; conflict between different criteria of, xiii; judgement of, xxii; analysis of, xxv²; *de jure* (by origin), xxv²; *de facto* (by apparent correctness), xxv², xlv; comparative, xxx; as a guide to individual readings, xxx; differs in different respects, xxii; of derivation modified by circumstances of transmission, xxxii; of revision relative to that of origin, essential but difficult to determine, xliii-xlv; of texts printed respectively from foul papers and playhouse manuscripts, 47-8.
- autographs and scribal copies alike found among playhouse manuscripts, 25.
- autographs, Shakespeare's, not as a rule prompt-books, vii; in the possession of Heminge and Condell, 29.
- 'bad' quartos, *see* quartos, 'bad'.
- Bald, R. C., *Bibliographical Studies in the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1647*, 135⁶; ed. of *A Game at Chess*, 137³, 141; 'Assembled' Texts (reply to Dover Wilson), 137³.
- Bales, Peter, his Brachygraphy (short-hand), in *The Writing Schoolmaster*, 1590, and *The Art of Brachygraphy*, 1597, 57-8, 85.
- Barnavelt, by Fletcher and Massinger, 23¹, 24-5, 28, 31, 33, 36, 40-1.
- Battle of Alcazar, The*, by G. Peele, plot preserved, character of printed text, 56.
- Beaumont, Francis, and Fletcher, John: plays of 1619-23 printed unexpurgated, their relation to *Othello*, 108; folio of 1647, in parts not capitalized, liii, line division in, liii², statements about manuscripts, 29, 153¹, evidence for private transcripts, 44, dedication signed by King's men, 153¹; folio of

- 1679, lv: *The Elder Brother, The Faithful Friends, The Honest Man's Fortune*, q.v.
- bed: 'bed put forth' in 2 *Hen. VI* F (discovered in Q), 159; 'enter . . . in her bed' in *Othello*, 173.
- Believe as you List* by P. Massinger, 23¹, 24-5, 31-2, 34, 36-9, 41, 43; massed entry in, 137.
- Belleforest, François de, *Histoires tragiques*, the source of *Hamlet*, 67.
- Bentley, Gerald Eades, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 44¹.
- 'bergomask' = a clownish dance, 124.
- 'best text', i.e. the most authoritative manuscript or edition, its position in editorial theory, xii, 182.
- Bestrafte Brudermord, Der*, German version of *Hamlet*, 65, 67, 68¹.
- Bevis, an actor in 2 *Hen. VI*, 159.
- bibliographical character of modern textual study, 3.
- bibliographical links between 'good' and 'bad' texts, in *Romeo*, 62, in *Hamlet*, 64², 66, in *Hen. V*, 70¹.
- bibliographical outlook in textual theory, liv.
- Black, M. W., and M. A. Shaaber, *Shakespeare's Seventeenth-Century Editors*, 155².
- Blagrove, William, his licence for a play as Herbert's deputy, 24.
- 'blocking' entrance in the Stationers' Register, made not with a view to publication but in order to prevent unauthorized printing, that of *M. of V.* possibly of this nature, 123.
- Blount, Edward, one of the publishers of the first folio, his possible share in the editing, 154; his entrances of *Pericles* and *Antony*, 20.
- Bolton, Joseph S. G., 'The authentic Text of "Titus Andronicus"' (*PMLA*, 1929, xlv. 776), 118².
- Bonduca* by J. Fletcher, 23¹, 25, 27, 29, 45; missing prompt-book recovered, 135.
- 'book': term for the prompt copy, 27; prompt copies inscribed 'The Book of —', 34; entrances of 'a book called the book of —', *M. of V.* and *Pericles*, 106, 123; see also prompt-book.
- 'book-holder' = prompter, 159.
- book-keeper or prompter, his function, 159; acts as producer, 32¹; annotates foul papers, 30, 124-5, 142; edits either foul or fair copy, 33; characteristics of his stage directions, 37; provides properties, 37; edits text and supplies speakers' names in *Sir Thomas More*, 104-5; possibly alters obsolete words, xxxiv, 99; makes stage alterations in 2 *Hen. IV*, 116-17; annotates *The Two Noble Kinsmen* for a revival, 152; his possible corrections in reprints, xi; credited with making a transcript for publication, 78, and with acting as a reporter, 60, 64.
- boys' parts cut out, 71.
- Brachygraphy, see P. Bales.
- Bright, Timothy, his *Charactery, an art of short, swift, and secret writing by character*, 57-9; its use alleged in *Rich. III*, 85, and *Lear*, 96.
- Brooke, C. F. Tucker, on revision in 2, 3 *Henry VI*, 54.
- Buc, Sir George, Master of the Revels: his patent as acting Master, 23 June 1603, 112¹; his licence preserved in *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*, 24, 24¹; licensed *Lear*, 96³, *Othello*, 110², *Troilus* (by deputy), 112¹, and *Winter's T.*, 150; plays licensed by him entered in the Stationers' Register, 1606-22, 106; his name in entry evidence that the prompt-book was used for registration, but not necessarily for printing, 107; censored Chapman's *Byron* for press after licence, and said to have licensed *A King and no King* for printing as well as acting, 107¹; his remarks on Bales's Brachygraphy in *The Third University of England*, 57.
- Cambridge editors of Shakespeare (W. G. Clark with John Glover (vol. i, 1863), with W. Aldis Wright (vols. ii-ix, 1863-6): but all references are to the second edition (1891-3) revised by Aldis Wright), 1; on quartos of *M. of V.*, xxv¹; on quartos of *Lear*, 4; on texts of *Rich. III*, 77;

- on *Othello* Q2, 111; on printing of *Jul. Cae.*, 143, and *Macbeth*, 147; unwarranted reliance on 'bad' quartos of *Romeo* and *Hamlet*, 75, on Q in *Rich. III.*, 84, on F in *Othello*, 110; vamping in 2 *Hen. IV.*, 115².
- Cambridge Shakespeare, The New, *see* J. D. Wilson.
- Cameron, K. W., on *Othello*, 108¹.
- cancel, to correct information concerning acting of *Troilus*, 112; to supply omission in 2 *Hen. IV.*, 116.
- canon: exclusion of *Pericles* from the first folio, 16, 19; Chetwind's additions in the third, 16; claim of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* to inclusion, 17; reasons for the inclusion of *Hen. VIII.*, 21, and 1 *Hen. VI.*, 139.
- Capell, Edward, recognized varying quality of quartos, 8²; rejected additions from *Shrew* Q, 75¹; vamping in 2 *Hen. IV.*, 115²; emendation in *Titus*, 119⁴.
- capitalization: (i) sporadic, individual habits of authors and printers, lii; (ii) as distinction of verse, usual in print but not in manuscripts, liii.
- Captives, The*, by T. Heywood, 23¹, 25, 29, 30-2, 38.
- Cardenio*, a lost play ascribed to Fletcher and Shakespeare by Moseley in an entry in the Stationers' Register in 1653, and possibly the basis of *Double Falsehood* published as an adaptation from Shakespeare by Lewis Theobald in 1728, 19.
- carelessness of composition due to theatrical conditions, viii.
- censor, cuts and alterations in prompt-books due to, 41; his demands in *Sir Thomas More*, 42; alters a play for press after it had been allowed for acting, 107¹; *see also* Master of the Revels.
- censoring, *see* profanity.
- chair: enter 'in a chair', 161, 173.
- Chamberlain, the Lord, his interventions in 1619 and 1637 to protect the King's men's plays, 44, 45, 110, 132.
- Chambers, Sir Edmund K., on the foul papers of *Bonduca*, 27¹; on date of revision of *Every Man in his Humour*, 42¹; on date of private transcripts, 45; suggests book-keeper as possible pirate, 60; on acceptance of acting licence for printing, 107²; on need of licence for private performance, 114¹; on date of actor list in the first folio, 131¹: *William Shakespeare*, iii, 23¹, 107², 131¹, 132, 135³, 154, 159, and individual plays *passim*; *The Elizabethan Stage*, 107¹, 135⁴; *The Disintegration of Shakespeare*, 40; *The Relation of the Contention of York and Lancaster to the Second and Third Parts of King Henry VI.*, 53; *Actors' 'Gag' in Elizabethan Plays* (cf. *W.S.*, i. 288), 56.
- changes, *see* alterations.
- Chapman, George, writes a tragedy on a plot by Jonson, 26; complains of the censoring of his *Byron*, 107¹: *An Humorous Day's Mirth*, q.v.
- characters in plays: confusion between, due to doubling, 61², 66¹, 81², 126, and to ambiguous prefixes, 81², 105¹, 122¹, 123; confusion between names of, xi², 142; reporter's confusion between similar, 70; amalgamation of, in *Lear* F, xxxiii, 100¹; substitution of, in 2 *Hen. IV.*, 115; names of, altered in *Hamlet*, 66, in *M.W.W.*, 72, in *Hen. IV.*, 132¹, 176.
- Charactery, *see* T. Bright.
- Charlemagne, 23¹, 24-5, 33, 35.
- Chettle, Henry, *Kind-heart's Dream*, 46²; edited *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit*, 49.
- Chetwind, Philip, publisher of the third folio, his additions to the canon, 16.
- Clark, William George, edited the Cambridge Shakespeare with (John Glover and) W. Aldis Wright, 1.
- Clark and Wright, *see* Cambridge editors (old).
- classical editor, his freedom of action, 182.
- Clavell, John, *The Soddered Citizen* (?), q.v.
- collaboration, between Shakespeare and Fletcher in 1612-13, 9; possible cause of want of cohesion in 1 *Hen. VI.*, 139¹.
- collection of Shakespeare's plays in 1619, 131-4.

Comedy of Errors, The, 140.

companies (theatrical), unwilling to multiply copies of their plays, 43; possible communal reporting by, 85-6.

composer: his errors are often a better guide to the original than the press reader's corrections, xlviii; they may resemble mishearings, 94; his treatment of passages marked for omission, 40⁴; produces textual tangles from confused copy, 104.

Condell (or Cundell), Henry, *see* Heminge and Condell.

conditional entrance in the Stationers' Register, allowed subject to further authority being obtained, as that of *M. of V.*, 123.

conflation of sources in 'mixed' texts, xiv, xviii; *see also* contamination.

confusion of characters: due to doubling of parts, in *Romeo*, 61², in *Hamlet*, 66¹, in *Rich. III* (rejected), 81², in *M.N.D.*, 126; due to ambiguous prefixes, in *Rich. III*, 81², in *An Humorous Day's Mirth*, 105¹, in *Much Ado*, 122¹, in *M. of V.*, 123; by a reporter in *Hen. V*, 70; or really between their names, in *K. John*, xi², 142.

'conjuror' = exorcist, 140¹.

conservative instincts confessed, liv².

'conservative' theory of editing as opposed to 'eclectic', xxvii.

conservative tradition, iv-v; beneficial but mistaken, liv.

Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles Duke of Byron, The, by G. Chapman, censored for press after licence, 107¹.

contamination, of substantive edition by earlier print, xvii; of report by omitted passages, 63, 70, 71; of different actors' parts, 63¹; by actors and reporters, 63¹; of transcript by recollection of performance, 65, 79, 114.

Contention, The, *see The First Part of the Contention*.

'continuous copy', an editorial figment, 42; possible instance, 139.

copyright, established in 'bad' texts, 12¹; none in *Pericles*, 20.

copy-text: its position in editorial

practice, the conception distinguished from that of the most authoritative text, liii-liv, 182; its readings in general to be faithfully followed, xxvi, and the balance to be always in their favour, xxix, but they are open to challenge by another substantive edition, xxx ff., or by a revised reprint, xxxviii ff., and to be rejected on sufficient evidence, xxx, though emendation is often to be preferred to rejection, xxxv¹; its accidental characteristics to be always followed, liv¹; necessary additions to, xxxv; editorial treatment of variants in, xlvii.

Corambus (so *Brudermord*; cf. *All's Well*, iv. iii. 185: 'Corambis' in Q1), substituted for Polonius in provincial version of *Hamlet*, 66, 165.

Coriolanus, 148.

'corrected copies', a misnomer, xlviii¹. corrected readings, those of a corrected forme, xlviii.

correction, not always distinguishable from revision, xx¹; errors introduced in the course of, xlviii.

corrections made by press reader in course of printing, not always correct, xlviii; their nature in *Lear*, 97; *see also* variation.

'correctness' as a guide to individual readings, and its numerical representation, xxx¹.

court performances, their length and the opportunities they offer for reporting, 96.

Court Secret, The, by J. Shirley, 23¹, 28, 41.

Cowley, Richard, played Verges in *Much Ado*, 122.

Crane, Ralph, one of three accomplished playhouse scribes connected with the King's men, 31; his transcripts of *Barnavelt* and *Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue*, 25, of *A Game at Chess*, *Demetrius and Enanthe*, and *The Witch*, 45; his system of scene division with massed entries, 137, and his graphic peculiarities, 115¹, 141; his use of 'Finis actus —', 182; his hand suspected in the first folio,

- 138¹, behind *M.W.W.*, 71², 2 *Hen. IV*, 115¹, 182, *Two Gent.*, 141, *M. for M.*, 146, *Winter's T.*, 151, *Tempest*, 151-2.
- critical edition: corrections permissible in its copy-text, x-xi; bound to take one original as its 'authority', xii, and all departures therefrom consequently seem violations of the basis, liv; must preserve the spelling and punctuation of the original, xii, 1; its fidelity to the original must depend on the character of the latter, xxii-xxiii.
- 'cum aliis', 166.
- 'curtains' = traverse, 160, 163.
- 'cushions', 148, 164.
- cutting in 'bad' quartos: whether in the performance reported or in the report, in *Romeo*, 63, in *Hamlet*, 66, in *Hen. V*, 70, in *M.M.W.*, 71; of boys' parts in *M.W.W.*, 71.
- cutting in performance, in *Hamlet*, 65; in *Rich. III*, 80; in *Lear*, 93, 96; in *Othello*, 108; in *Troilus*, 113; in 2 *Hen. IV*, 114; in *K. John*, 142; in *All's Well*, 145; in *M. for M.*, 146; in *Macbeth*, 147; of minor parts in *Lear* 100¹.
- cutting in printing, in *Hamlet*, 65⁴; in *Rich. III*, 80; in *Rich. II*, 121.
- Cymbeline*, 150.
- Daborne, Robert, correspondence with Henslowe, side-lights on play-writing, 27-8, and on actors' parts, 46.
- Daniel, Peter Augustin, his importance as a textual critic, 3¹; on *Lear*, 13¹, 97; on *Rich. III*, 78, 86².
- deletion, marks of, in prompt-books, 40.
- Demetrius and Enanthe*, by J. Fletcher, 23¹, 45.
- 'derivation', ambiguity of, xiv.
- derivative and substantive editions, the distinction between, xiii, is quantitative, xv, sometimes difficult or conventional, even insignificant, xxi.
- derivative editions (McKerrow's 'derived editions'), defined as substantially unaltered reprints, xv; may contain substantive passages, xvi.
- derivative passages in substantive editions, xv; editorial treatment, xxxvi².
- 'dern' = sombre, drear, 100.
- directions, *see* stage directions.
- Discoveries*; B. Jonson, *Timber, or Discoveries made upon Men and Matter*, 154¹.
- division, *see* act and scene division.
- Doctor Faustus*, relation of the texts an unsolved problem, that of 1616 probably 'mixed', xvi³.
- Doran, Madeleine, on 2, 3 *Hen. VI*, 53; *The Text of 'King Lear'* (see also 'Elements in the Composition of "King Lear"' in *Studies in Philology*, 1933, xxx. 34), 89, 100¹, 134¹; *The Quarto of 'King Lear' and Short-hand*, 96².
- doubling of parts: confusion of characters due to, in *Romeo*, 61², in *Hamlet*, 66¹, in *Rich. III*, 81², in *M.N.D.*, 126; may lead to conflation, 63¹.
- 'doubtful' quartos (*Rich. III* and *Lear*), *see* quartos, 'bad'.
- dramatis personae, lists of, in play manuscripts, 45.
- Dulwich College, founded by Edward Alleyn, Henslowe's correspondence preserved at, 27; plot and part preserved at, 45³.
- duplication in stage directions: due to editing, in *M. of V.*, 123, 179, in *M.N.D.*, 125-6, in *Errors*, 140, in *A.Y.L.I.*, 144, in *Coriol.*, 149¹; due to massed entries, in *Pericles*, 136¹, 170, in *Believe as you List* (?), 137¹, in 2 *Hen. IV*, 137², 175, in *M.W.W.*, 168, in *Rich. II*, 177.
- duplication in the text: due to alteration or revision, in *Romeo*, 61, in *Hamlet*, 65¹, in *Troilus*, 113 (but this may be due to conflation, 114¹), in *L.L.L.*, 127; editorial treatment, xi.
- Duthie, George Ian, *The 'Bad' Quarto of Hamlet*, iii, 8¹, 59¹, 65², 66², 68¹, 70¹.
- eclectic methods of Shakespearian editors, reaction against, v; has been excessive, fundamental mistake of, liv².
- 'eclectic' theory of editing, opposed to 'conservative', xxviii.

editing, of 2 *Hen. IV* in the folio, 117;
of *Titus* in a quarto reprint, 118;
divergent in quarto and folio, in
Othello, 109, and *Troilus*, 112.

editing, critical, its cardinal problem to
determine the foundations of the
text, 2.

editions, distinct; printed from the
same manuscript, xxv, their textual
features analogous to those of manu-
scripts, xxxi; printed in part from the
same setting of type, xlv².

editor or editors of the first folio, 141, 153.
editorial agreement in a standard text,
xxvii.

editorial dilemma in choice of copy-
text, ix, xiii.

editorial implications of textual history
of *Rich. III*, 88, and of *Lear*, 100.

editorial position in Shakespeare, sum-
mary of, 156.

editorial treatment, of derivative pas-
sages in substantive texts, xxxvi²; of
substantive passages in derivative
texts, xxxviii; of authorial revisions,
xlv.

Edmond Ironside, 231, 25, 35.

Elder Brother, The, by Fletcher and
Massinger, 231, 45; relation of a
reprint to an extant manuscript,
xli².

Ellis-Fermor, Una, on *Timon*, 182.

emendation, not a source of authority,
xiv; of copy-text may be preferable
to its rejection, xxxv¹.

entrance in the Stationers' Register, a
claim to the copy, see registration.

entrances of characters, sometimes
marked too early, 38, 85², 143¹;
warning of, 39.

errors, determination of them in the
copy-text, xxxiii-xxxiv; 'demon-
strable' and 'manifest', xxvi, xxxv¹;
may be accidentally introduced in the
course of correcting the type, xlviii.

Escapes of Jupiter, The, by T. Hey-
wood, 231, 25.

'exet', a possibly intentional though
erroneous form, 160.

external evidence, of relation of texts,
xxiii¹; for revision in Shakespearean
reprints, xxiii¹, xlii¹; needs corrobora-

tion by internal evidence before being
accepted, xlv.

facility of composition, Shakespeare's
and Fletcher's, 29; Heywood's, 30.

failure of memory in report, 82-3, 90-1.
fair copy by author, postulated for crit-
ical edition, x; production of, 27-8.

Faithful Friends, The, ascribed to Beau-
mont and Fletcher by Moseley in an
entry in the Stationers' Register in
1660, 231, 26, 28, 45.

Farmer, Richard, and *Pericles*, 171.

Faustus, see *Doctor Faustus*.

fidelity of reproduction, must depend
on character of copy-text, xxii-xxiii;
rival views respecting the degree and
conditions of, xxvi; governed by
'authority', xxx; varies with the rela-
tion between substantive editions,
xxx ff.

'finis actus —', in *L.L.L.*, 1281; in *Two
Gent.*, 141; in *Twelfth N.*, 145; in
The Witch and *A Game at Chess*,
182.

first drafts or reports, alternative views
of 'bad' quartos, 9, 55.

First Part of the Contention, The, see
2 *Henry VI*.

Fletcher, John, his autographs seen by
Moseley, 29; his collaboration with
Shakespeare in *Hen. VIII*, *The Two
Noble Kinsmen*, and *Cardenio*, 19;
with Massinger in *Barnavelt* and
The Elder Brother, q.v.; his altera-
tions in *Bonduca*, q.v.; see also
Demetrius and Eranthe, and Beau-
mont and Fletcher.

folio, first, of Shakespeare's plays: its
claims to authority and correction,
6, xlii¹; its treatment of the text, 15;
its imperfect classification of the
plays, 151; its treatment of plays only
in part Shakespeare's, 19, 21; printed
plays from manuscript though quar-
tos available, *Hamlet*, 64, and *Othello*,
108, and possibly 2 *Hen. IV*, 115;
date of its printing, 129; authority
of its attributions, 139; its editing,
153; authorship of 'The Epistle
Dedicatory' and address 'To the
great Variety of Readers', 154; its

- tendency to omissions, xxxvi, and to split lines, liii.
- folio, first, its editor or editors: their identity, 14, 153; possibly altered obsolescent words, xxxiv, 99; their inconsistent methods but general solicitude for the text, 130; their sophistication of the text, 154, in *Othello*, 110, and see individual plays *passim*.
- folio, third, its additions to the canon, 16,
- folio, fourth, used by Rowe as the basis of his text, 4.
- folios, later, editing of, 155.
- 'for' = disguised as or in the part of, *A.Y.L.I.*, 144, *M. of V.*, 144¹, 179, *L.L.L.*, 144¹, 180.
- four sheets or papers, the author's rough copy of a play, 27; sometimes preserved by the company, 27, 33; handed over by Daborne, 28; their appearance, 28; possible fragment extant of *The Massacre at Paris*, 28, and probable example in *The Captives*, 29; Shakespeare's in the possession of Heminge and Condell, 29; their character, 31; may contain passages not finally revised, ix, 102-3, 156; McKerrow's theory of their use as copy for quartos, 102; and see individual plays *passim*.
- Frankfort book-fair, John Bill's catalogue of English books sold there, 131¹.
- French, pirate's apparent knowledge of, in *Hen. V*, 69.
- Gabriel (Spenser), an actor in 3 *Hen. VI*, 161.
- 'gag' by actors, 56.
- Game at Chess, A*, by T. Middleton, 23¹; private transcripts, autograph and by Crane, 45, 182; Crane's transcripts, 137, 141.
- 'garmombles' = Mömpelgart?, in Q of *M.W.W.*, 72.
- Gascoine, a stage hand in *Believe as you List*, 39.
- Gaw, Allison, *Actors' Names in Basic Shakespearean Texts*, 40¹; *John Sinklo as one of Shakespeare's Actors*, 1163.
- 'ghost' characters, in *Romeo*, 163; in 2 *Hen. IV*, 176; in *Much Ado* (Innogen), 178.
- Giordano-Orsini, G. N., *Thomas Heywood's Play on 'The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth'*, 58.
- 'Globe' edition of Shakespeare, its dependence on Q in *Lear*, 90, 101; directions in *Hamlet*, 164.
- Globe playhouse, statement that *Troilus* had been acted there withdrawn, 112; fire at, 135.
- 'good' quartos, see quartos, 'good'.
- Granville-Barker, Harley, on cutting in *Lear*, 96.
- graphic confusions, 98.
- graphic similarity between variants points to misprint, xxxiii.
- Gray, Henry David, *The First Quarto 'Hamlet'*, 662.
- Greene, Robert, accused of selling a play to two companies, 27; his bad handwriting, 46; his attack on Shakespeare in *Groatsworth of Wit*, 49; his opinion of actors in *Never too Late*, 51: *John of Bordeaux* (?) and *Orlando Furioso*, q.v.
- Greg, W. W., *Henslowe's Diary and Henslowe Papers*, 261; *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses*, xli², 23¹, 45³, 158; *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements: 'Alcazar' and 'Orlando'*, 56; ed. of Shakespeare's *'Merry Wives of Windsor'*, 1602, 60, 71; *The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear'*, xlviii, 973; *The Function of Bibliography in Literary Criticism illustrated in a Study of the Text of 'King Lear'*, 973; *'King Lear'—Mislineation and Stenography*, 95¹, 1082; *The Staging of 'King Lear'*, 965; *On Certain False Dates in Shakespearean Quartos*, 1312; *'The First Folio and its Publishers' in Studies in the First Folio*, 1312, 154¹; *'The Spanish Tragedy'—a Leading Case?*, 121; *'Principles of Emendation in Shakespeare' (British Academy Shakespeare Lecture) in Aspects of Shakespeare*, 672, 751; *Massinger's Autograph Corrections in 'The Duke of Milan'*, 1623, and *More Massinger*

- Corrections*, xl²; McKerrow's 'Prolegomena' *Reconsidered*, liv²; *Bibliography—an Apologia*, liv².
- Griffin, William J., *An Omission in the Folio Text of 'Richard III'*, 80¹.
- hair: 'her hair down', 166; 'her hair about her ears', 171, 174.
- half-lines, printing in, liii, 108.
- Hamlet*, 64, 164: divergence of texts, viii; choice between foul papers and prompt-book, ix, xxxv¹; Q₂ for copy-text, xxxiii; substantive texts of comparable but not balanced authority, xxiv, xxxi; statement on title of Q₂, xxiii¹, xlii¹; omissions in Q₂, xxxv; relative credibility of playhouse scribe and Q₂ compositor, xxxiv²; directions for fencing altered in F, xli³; McKerrow doubtful about the text, xxix⁴; Shakespeare not concerned in production of prompt-book, 32¹; excessive use of Q₁ by Cambridge editors, 75; implication of agreement between texts, 76.
- Hamlet*, pre-Shakespearian, 65³, 67, 68.
- Harington, Sir John, catalogue of his collection of plays (B.M. MS. Add. 27632, fol. 43^a), 46.
- head-title added to manuscript play, apparently for publication, 45.
- Heminge (or Hemminges), John, his man Tawyer, 125; and see Heminge and Condell.
- Heminge, John, and Condell, Henry, editors of the first folio, their claims on its behalf, 5; their responsibility, 14¹, 153-4; their treatment of the text, 14; on Shakespeare's facility in writing, 29; had Shakespeare's autograph rough copies in their possession, 29; supplied playhouse manuscripts for the collection, 48; their position in the company and personal relation to Shakespeare, 153¹; their views on the value of playhouse manuscripts, xliii³.
- Hengist King of Kent*, 23¹, 36.
- Henry IV*, originally called *Oldcastle*, 132¹.
- Henry IV*, part 1, 128, 180; unwarranted claim of Q₃ to be 'corrected', xlii¹.
- Henry IV*, part 2, 114, 174; relation of the texts obscure, xxxi, 182, but perhaps of comparable authority, xxiv, F being possibly a 'mixed' text of inferior quality, xxi¹, combining major and minor revision, xxxix¹; additional passages in F, xvi, xxxvi¹; its massed entries, 137², 176.
- Henry V*, 68, 167; the copy claimed by Pavier, 20; echoed in *Hamlet* Q₁, 68; reprinted in 1619, 132.
- Henry VI*, part 1, 138; of doubtful authorship, included in the folio as part of trilogy, 21.
- Henry VI*, parts 2 and 3, 52; controversy over, 50-2; reprinted in 1619, 131; reported by actors, 60; derivative passages in F, xvi.
- Henry VI*, part 2, 159; clownage episodes in Q, 56; revision in the reprint of 1619, xli⁴.
- Henry VI*, part 3, 161; an actor's name in F, 116³.
- Henry VIII*, 152; only in part Shakespeare's, 19; included in the folio to round off the Histories, 21.
- Henslowe, Philip, financed companies of actors, 26; preserved Daborne's correspondence, 27-8; his evidence regarding revision, 41, and the price of old plays, 44.
- Herbert, Sir Henry, Master of the Revels, his licences preserved in *The Honest Man's Fortune*, *Believe as you List*, *The Launching of the Mary*, (by deputy) in *The Lady Mother*, 24, and in *The Walks of Islington and Hogsden*, 182; licensed *The Captives*, 30, *The Honest Man's Fortune* and *Winter's T.*, 135, *Winter's T.*, 150, and *Roxana*, 182; refused to license the original version of *Believe as you List*, 32, 41; demanded a fair copy of *The Launching of the Mary*, 33; plays licensed by him entered in the Stationers' Register in 1624 and 1627-38, 106²; his licences to print, 107¹; fussy over licences, 43; complained of actors' parts being prepared before licence, 46; his evidence respecting revision, 41; received payment to restrain the acting of Shakespeare's plays, 44¹.

- 'here', in stage directions, its use in
1 *Hen. VI* and other plays, 139; in
M. of V. 124; in *K. John*, 143; in
Coriol., 148; in *Winter's T.*, 150; in
2 *Hen. VI*, 159; in 3 *Hen. VI*, 161;
in *Rich. III.*, 171; in *Lear*, 173.
- 'here comes so-and-so', frequency of
the formula, 382; does not indicate
anticipation, 852.
- heterogeneous copy (i.e. copy in several
hands), 139.
- Heywood, Thomas, his facility of
composition, 30; on the double sale
of plays, 27; on the use of Steno-
graphy in piracy, and on plays
copied by the ear, 58; his *Queen
Elizabeth* or *If you Know not Me you
Know Nobody*, part 1, pirated, 58,
revision in part 2, xxxviii¹; *Pleasant
Dialogues and Dramas*, 58; *The
Rape of Lucrece*, 272, 58; *The Cap-
tives* and *The Escapes of Jupiter* q.v.
- Hjort (Hort), Greta, or *Romeo and
L.L.L.*, 127.
- Holinshed, Raphael, his Chronicle
used in 2, 3 *Hen. VI*, 54; its use in
emending Shakespeare, 76.
- Holland, John, an actor in 2 *Hen. VI*,
159.
- Honest Man's Fortune, The*, by Beau-
mont and Fletcher, 23¹, 24-5, 31,
135.
- Hoppe, H. R., *The First Quarto
Version of 'Romeo and Juliet'*, II. vi
and IV. v. 43 ff., 63.
- Housman, A. E., on 'the best manu-
script' (*M. Manilius Astronomicum
liber I*, 1937, pp. xxx ff.), 182.
- Hubert, a stage-hand in *Believe as you
List*, 39.
- Humorous Day's Mirth, An*, by G.
Chapman, acted by the Admiral's
men as *The Comedy of Humours*, a
textual tangle in, 105.
- Humphrey (Jeffes?), an actor in 3
Hen. VI, 161.
- insertions, interpolations, *see* additions.
- Isaac, Frank, on the printing of *Rich.
III.*, 874.
- italic used for the part of the Nurse in
Romeo Qq 1 and 2, 62.
- Jaggard, William, his printing house,
the collections of 1619 and 1623 both
printed there, 130-2.
- Jaques, Francis, *The Queen of Corsica*,
q.v.
- 'Johannes fac totum' and the myth of
Shakespeare's apprenticeship as a
play-vamper, 50-2.
- John a Kent*, by A. Munday, 23¹, 24,
33-4.
- John of Bordeaux*, by R. Greene (?),
23¹, 24, 35.
- Johnson, Samuel, *Proposals for Print-
ing the Works of Shakespeare*, 181; his
views on Shakespeare's manuscripts,
18; his opinion on 2, 3 *Hen. VI*, 52.
- Jonson, Benjamin: his masque of
Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue trans-
cribed by Crane, 25¹; shows a plot
to the Admiral's men, 26; Chapman
works on a plot of his, 26; he pre-
pares a collection of his Works, 157,
in which *Every Man in his Humour*
is revised extensively, but *Volpone*,
Catiline, and other plays only in
detail, xix-xx, 42¹, and which pro-
vided a natural model for editors,
137; his system of scene division, 137;
the descriptions in his masques, 151¹;
the 'third volume' of his Works
edited by Sir K. Digby, 130¹;
possibly the author of the preface and
dedication in the Shakespeare first
folio, 154; his views on the unblotted
lines expressed in *Discoveries*, 154¹;
the missing quarto of *Epicene*, xix⁴.
- Jove, humorous substitute for God, 145.
- Julius Caesar*, 143; recollection of in
Lear Q, 92¹.
- Kemp, William, played Dogberry in
Much Ado, 122, and Peter in *Romeo*,
163.
- King John*, 142; confusion of names in,
xi².
- King John, The Troublesome Reign of*,
52, 142, 143¹.
- King Lear*, 88, 172; divergent texts of,
viii; choice of copy-text, xxiii, xlv;
relation of the texts, Q apparently
reported, xxiv; F a 'mixed' text,
xviii, but authoritative, xxxiv; au-

- thority of Q not comparable, xxxii; cuts in both texts, xxxvi; F inherits errors from Q, xxxiii, xlix; amalgamation of minor parts in F, xxxiii, 100¹; misprints and corrections in Q, xlviii²; McKerrow doubtful about the texts, xxix⁴; Q reprint of 1619, 132, its possible value, 1, 134³.
- King Lear*, *The Chronicle History of*, 52.
- King's men: their scribes Crane and Knight, 25, 31; their plays divided into acts, 36; own *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*, 36, also *Believe as you List* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, 39², also *A Game at Chess* and *The Duchess of Malfy*, 137³; allow transcripts to be made of their plays, 44; restrain the Red Bull company from acting Shakespeare's plays, 44¹; obtain protection for their plays from the Lord Chamberlain, 44, 132; object to the publication of *Troilus*, 112; some of their 'books' missing, 135; sign the dedication in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647, 153¹.
- Kirschbaum, Leo, *A Census of Bad Quartos*, 56.
- Knight, Edward (?), book-keeper of the King's company, his transcripts of *The Honest Man's Fortune* and *Bonduca*, 25, 45; prepared *Believe as you List* and *The Soderred Citizen* for the stage, 25; one of the company's most accomplished scribes, 31.
- Kyd, Thomas, possibly the author of the pre-Shakespearean *Hamlet*, 67-8: *Spanish Tragedy*, q.v..
- Lady Mother, The*, 23¹, 24-5, 36, 41.
- Launching of the Mary, The*, by W. Mountfort, 23¹, 24-5, 32, 36, 41, 43.
- Lear*, see *King Lear*.
- Lee, Sir Sidney, on the varying quality of quartos, 8; his pessimistic views on the text, 18; his imaginative characterization of playhouse manuscripts, 22.
- length of performance, 96.
- licences by the Master of the Revels: for acting, 24, 30, 106, 135, 150, 182; for printing, 106, 110², 112¹; licence to act accepted as licence to print, 107.
- line division: authors' practice erratic, editorial freedom, liii; tendency to print in half-lines in the Shakespeare and Beaumont and Fletcher folio, liii, 108.
- literary copies, see private transcripts.
- locality notes in stage directions: 'the forest of Gaultree', 116, 175; 'the Tower', 159-60; 'London Stone', 159-60; 'Saint Albans', 160; 'Harflew', 167.
- 'long' interval between acts marked, 36.
- Love's Labour's Lost*, 126, 180; Q1 claims on title to be 'corrected', xlii¹, 11; a 'bad' quarto probably lost, 11.
- Macbeth*, 147; mutilated, viii; an error in the text, xi².
- McKerrow, Ronald Brunlees, his critical position, iv-v; on Rowe's use of quartos and earlier folios, 4¹; his theory of quartos printed from foul papers, and of an author's use of actors' names, 40; his views on 2, 3 *Hen. VI*, 53, and the use of Holinshed in 2 *Hen. VI*, 54; his theory of passages in 'good' texts borrowed from 'bad' quartos, 54; recognized *A Shrew* as derivative, 73³; recognized *Rich. III* Q as reported, 79; note on an omission in *Rich. III* F, 80¹; his theory that inconsistency in the use of speakers' names indicates autograph copy, 103, 127, 140, 142; his views on 'massed' entries, 138¹: *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare*, its importance and limitations, iv, ix-lv *passim*, 108²; *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, xlviii¹, 159; ed. of *The Devil's Charter*, xlviii¹, *An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students*, xlviii¹; *The Treatment of Shakespeare's Text by his Earlier Editors*, 1709-1768, 4¹; *The Elizabethan Printer and Dramatic Manuscripts*, 40¹, 102; *A Note on 'Henry VI, Part II', and 'The Contention of York and Lancaster'*, 54; *A Note on the 'Bad Quartos' of 2 and 3 'Henry VI' and the Folio Text*, 54; *A Suggestion regarding Shakespeare's Manuscripts*, 103, 138¹.

- Malone, Edmund, on the editorial problem, 2¹; his mistaken views on the quartos, 7; included *Pericles* in the canon, 17¹; demurred to Johnson's view of Shakespeare's text, 18; his misinterpretation of Greene's attack on Shakespeare, 49; his theory of the composition of 2, 3 *Hen. VI*, 50; his condemnation of F₂, 155²: *Preface* to his edition of 1790, 2¹, 7¹, 18¹, 155² (1821, i. 208); *A Dissertation on the Three Parts of King Henry VI* (1821, xviii. 553), 50. 'manent', rare use of plural, 170, 181. manuscripts: used to supply additions in reprint, xvi, used to alter character of reprint, xviii; used to make corrections in reprint, xl; that used may have been tampered with, xx¹; some extant ones may have been edited for press, 45; character of those submitted for entrance in Stationers' Register, 106. 'march, English (Danish)', 139, 165. marginal additions, liii, 118, 125. Marlowe, Christopher, thefts from him in *A Shrew*, 73: *The Massacre at Paris*, q.v. *Massacre at Paris, The*, by C. Marlowe, fragmentary manuscript and corrupt print, 28. massed entries: regular, in *M.W.W. F*, 70, 136, 168, in *Two Gent.*, 136, 141, in *Winter's T.*, 136, 151, in *The Duchess of Malfy*, 137³; sporadic, in *Othello Q*, 109, in 2 *Hen. IV Q* and *F*, 115¹, 116, 137², 176, in 1 *Hen. IV F*, 129, 180, in *Rich. II Q*, 177, in *Pericles*, 136¹, 170; an instance in the manuscript of *Believe as you List*, 136-7, and regular occurrence in a manuscript of *A Game at Chess*, 137, 182, suggest possible explanation, 137. Massinger, Philip, his autograph corrections in presentation copies of his plays, xl²: *Barnavelt* (with Fletcher), *Believe as you List*, *The Elder Brother* (with Fletcher), *The Parliament of Love*, q.v. Master of the Revels, licenser of plays, see Ashley, Buc, Herbert, Tilney. Matthews, W., *Shorthand and the Bad Shakespeare Quartos*, and *Shakespeare and the Reporters*, 59¹. *Measure for Measure*, 146. 'meet them', 144; 'meet him', 170; 'meets them', 170. memorial corrections, xl; unreliable, xli. memory, failure of, in report, 82-3, 90-1. *Merchant of Venice, The*, 123, 179; 'book' registered, 106; reprint of 1619, 132; erratic capitalization in Q₁, liii. *Merry Wives of Windsor, The*, 70, 168; reprint of 1619, 131; Q₃ claims on title to be 'corrected', xlii¹. metrical confusion in *Lear Q*, 95. metrical structure often obscure in manuscript and disregarded by printer, liii. Middleton, Thomas, his knowledge of, and suspected contribution to, *Macbeth*, 147: *A Game at Chess* and *The Witch*, q.v. *Midsummer-Night's Dream, The*, 124, 179; reprint of 1619, 132; the ass head in F, 37. misapprehension in report, 93. misassignment of speeches, in *Rich. III*, 85; in *Lear*, 94; in 2 *Hen. IV*, 115. mishearing in report, in *M.W.W.*, 71; in *Rich. III*, 84; in *Lear*, 94. misinterpretation, of a misprinted line, 126; in report, 93. mislinning, due to shorthand in *Lear*, 95; to marginal addition in *M.N.D.*, 125; to the author in *Antony*, 147, and *Coriol.*, 148. misplacement of fragments of text in report, 63. misprints, indicated by graphic similarity between readings, xxxiii; do not necessarily produce nonsense, xxxiv¹. 'mixed' texts: recognized and classed as 'substantive', xiv; two types, revised and conflated, xvii; inconvenient as copy-texts, xxiv¹, but this not a serious objection, liv-lv; may be of inferior character, xxi. modernized spelling, bad results of, li.

- modernizing editor, his freedom of action, liv, 182.
- Mommsen, Tycho, correctly interpreted Heminge and Condell's remarks on quartos, 81.
- More*, see *Sir Thomas More*.
- mosaic of phrases in report, 63, 69.
- Moseley, Humphrey, publisher of the Beaumont and Fletcher first folio, on Fletcher's unblotted papers, 29; on private transcripts of plays, 44; on the dispersal and collection of the manuscripts, 153¹.
- Mountfort, Walter, *The Launching of the Mary*, q.v.
- Much Ado about Nothing*, 121, 178.
- Munday, John, *John a Kent and Sir Thomas More* (with others), q.v.
- names of characters, confusion between, by the author, xi², 142; due to inadequate designation, 81², 105¹, 122¹, 123.
- Neidig, William J., on the 1619 collection, 131².
- Nicoll, Allardyce, on the editing of the second folio, 155².
- 'night gown', 161 ('gown', but cf. 162), 165, 173, 175.
- normalization of spelling, an alternative to modernization, the aim of early printers, but not practicable, li.
- North, Sir Thomas, his version of Plutarch's *Lives*, its use in emending Shakespeare, 76.
- obsolescent or unusual words altered by the book-keeper or editor, xxxiv, 99.
- omission: marks of, in prompt-books, 40; a characteristic of reporting, 84; in printing, supplied by a cancel, 116.
- oral mistakes, see mishearing.
- Orlando Furioso*, by R. Greene, actor's part preserved at Dulwich College, 45³, 46; character of the printed text, 56; manner of printing speakers' names, 117².
- Othello*, 108, 173; Q and F divergent texts, viii, substantive and of comparable and balanced authority, xxiv, xxxi, affording textual conditions analogous to those of manuscripts, xxxi; passages omitted in Q1, xxxvi, added in Q2, xvi³; McKerrow doubtful about the text, xxix⁴; use of parentheses in F, 115¹.
- Pape, Otto, on use of shorthand in *Rich. III*, 85.
- paraphrase in reports, in *Romeo* 63, in *Hen. V*, 69; in *Rich. III*, 84; in *Lear*, 90.
- parentheses, lavish use of, 115¹, 141.
- Parliament of Love, The*, by P. Mas-singer, 23¹, 24-5.
- part (= role), one actor's printed in italic in *Romeo*, Qq 1 and 2, 62; one imperfectly cut in *Hamlet* Q1, 66¹.
- parts, doubling of, 61¹, 63¹; confusion due to, in *Romeo*, 61²; in *Hamlet*, 66¹; in *Rich. III*, 81²; in *M.N.D.*, 126.
- parts, actors' written, 45; possibly used for reports, in *Romeo*, 62, in *Hamlet*, 67, in *Hen. V*, 70, 70¹.
- Patrick, David Lyall, *The Textual History of 'Richard III'*, 79, 85-6, 86².
- Pavier, Thomas, republished *Pericles*, 20; had a claim to *Hen. V*, 20; published the 1619 collection, 131.
- Peele, George, *The Battle of Alcazar*, q.v.
- Pericles*, 74, 170; its position in the canon, 16-17; its exclusion from the first folio, 19; its surreptitious publication, vii, in spite of the entrance of the 'book', 106; reprinted in 1619, 131, with some correction, 134²; massed entry in, 136¹.
- 'period' spelling, lii.
- Pinch, a schoolmaster, in *Errors*, 140.
- piracy, real but not very important, its stinging, 43; by actors or by book-keeper, 60; see also reporting.
- pirated texts reported not stolen, 43.
- plague of 1592-3, its effect on the London companies and on the publication of plays, 57.
- 'players' quartos', term used by the Cambridge editors for certain late quartos of current acting texts, 23.
- playhouse corrections in reprints, their character, xli.
- playhouse manuscripts, include both autographs and scribal copies, 25; nature and authority of the text, 18,

- 47-8; available for Shakespeare's plays, 48.
- plays, read to the company for approval, 26, by instalments, 27; piecemeal delivery of the manuscript, 26, 28; authorized editions may have been printed from autographs, 34; prices paid for old ones, 44; acting printed ones, 44; transcripts allowed by the King's men, 44, at a certain price, 44³; authority of editions printed from playhouse manuscripts, 48.
- plots (dramatic), schemes for plays submitted by authors: one drawn up by Jonson and worked on by Chapman, 26; of scenes in *The Faithful Friends* and *Henry Richmond*, 26; their wording perhaps traceable in stage directions, 146¹.
- plots (theatrical) skeleton outlines of plays used in the playhouse, 45³, 46; kept with the 'book', 34, 135; suggested use in a report, 70; suggested use in 'assembled' texts not borne out by the evidence, 136.
- Pollard, Alfred William, his interpretation of Heminge and Condell's remarks on the quartos, 8; his distinction between 'good' and 'bad' quartos, 9; his reason for including *Pericles* among the 'bad', 74; modification needed in his theory, 11, recognized by him, 12¹; his claim of playhouse origin for most, and autograph origin for some, of Shakespeare's texts, 18, 48; on 'continuous copy' and the release of plays for printing, 44; connects 'bad' quartos with the plague of 1592-3, 57; on additions in the course of printing, 87⁴; suggests Blount as author of the preface in the first folio, 154: *The Foundations of Shakespeare's Text*, 2, 156 (p. 16); *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos*, 8, 13, 154 (p. 122); *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates*, 17, 29¹; 'Shakespeare's Text' in *A Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, 12¹, 104¹; *The 'Stolne and Surreptitious' Shakespearean Texts*, with J. D. Wilson, 43¹; Introduction to facsimile of *Richard II* Q 3, 120-1.
- Pope, Alexander, his use of *Romeo* Q1, 75, of *A Shrew* 75¹; his treatment of a passage in 2 *Hen. IV*; began the restoration of quarto readings, but a great corrupter of the text, 155².
- press reader, may have altered obsolete or unusual words, xxxiv; nature of his corrections in *Lear*, 97.
- Price, Hereward T., *The Text of Henry V*, 70¹.
- printer, see compositor.
- printing, payment to stay the printing of a play, 44; alterations in the course of, 115.
- printing licences by the Master of the Revels, 96³, 106-7, 110², 112¹, 113¹.
- private performances, of *Lear*, 96; of *Troilus*, 112; of *M.N.D.* at a wedding, 124; of *Errors*, 140.
- private transcripts of plays, 44; possibly used in the folio for *Othello*, 110, for *Troilus*, 113-14, for *All's Well*, 146, for *Winter's T.*, 151.
- producer, his function exercised earlier by the stage-manager or book-keeper, 32¹.
- producer's manuscripts, used for *Antony*, 148, and *Coriol.*, 148; and behind *Cymb.*, 150, and *Hen. VIII*, 152.
- profanity, reformation of: interferes with authority of the text, xxxii; perhaps the work of the folio editor rather than the book-keeper, 155¹; in *Rich. III*, xxxii, 88¹; in *Othello*, 108, 111; in 2 *Hen. IV*, 117; in *Rich. II*, 121; in *M. of V.*, 124; in 1 *Hen. IV*, 129; in *Twelfth N.*, 145; in some Beaumont and Fletcher quartos, 108.
- prompt-books, as textual authority, ix, 156; submitted for registration, 20, 106, 123, but not necessarily used as copy, 107; normally made up of separate numbered sheets, 28; either autograph or prepared by a playhouse scribe, 32-3; their appearance, 34; sometimes kept with the plot, 34; position of entrance directions in, 38; their evidence concerning alteration, 40; marks of omission and deletion in, 40; substitution and insertion in, 41; could be recon-

- structed from parts and plot, 47; damage made good by insertion of leaves from a quarto, 87; in a few cases there may never have been a formal one, 33, 114; *see also* individual plays *passim*.
- prompter, *see* book-keeper.
- pronunciation, its relation to spelling, li; shown by rimes, 94.
- proof, alterations in, 117.
- prose: printed as verse, 69, 95, 170; verse printed as prose, 95; prose and verse differently rendered by reporter, 69.
- punctuation: that of original to be followed in a critical edition, xii, lii; original often deficient though sometimes effective, printers' systems, and modern tendencies, lii; whether the heavy pointing of the folio is due to the book-keeper or the printer, 67¹; deficient and erroneous in *Lear* Q, 95, sometimes surviving in F, 99; traces of the author's in *Rich. II*, 120; careful in *Tempest*, 151.
- 'quaint device', 157.
- quartos, Heminge and Condell on, 7; Malone on, 7; Pollard on, 8, and his classification into 'good' and 'bad', 9; texts of later quartos not yet fully investigated, 23; a late quarto (*M.W.W.*) printed from the folio, xlii¹; a late quarto (*Othello*) supplemented from the folio, 111.
- quartos used as prompt books: improbable as a general custom, xl, 15, but supported by provincial evidence, 15¹, 182; has been suggested in the case of *Titus*, 120, of *Rich. II*, 121, of *Much Ado*, 122, of *M. of V.*, 124, of *M.N.D.*, 126, of *L.L.L.*, 128.
- quartos, 'bad' (including 'doubtful'): condemned as textual authorities, xxiv, xxxii; instances outside Shakespeare, 56; a lost one of *L.L.L.*, 11, 127; whether first drafts or reports, 9, 55; their irregular publication, 10, 12; their rejection by the folio editors, 10; all but one superseded either by 'good' quartos or in the folio, 10; their publication might interfere with that of a 'good' text, 12¹, 182; essentially reports of full texts, 57, 60, or perhaps of stage versions, 61¹, possibly of versions subsequently revised, 61; characterized by inequality of text, 62; possibly made use of actors' parts, 62, 67, 70, 70¹; in *Hamlet* perhaps contaminated by an earlier play, 67; their possible connexion with the plague of 1592-3, 57; copies consulted in printing 'good' texts of 2, 3 *Hen. VI*, 54-5, of *Romeo*, 62, of *Hamlet*, 64², of *Hen. V*, 70, of *Rich. III*, 86²; copies used after correction as copy for 'good' texts of *Rich. III*, 86, of *Lear*, 97, probably of part of *Romeo*, 62, and possibly of *L.L.L.*, 127; their editorial value, and the use made of them by editors in *Shrew*, *M.W.W.*, *Romeo*, and *Hamlet*, 75.
- quartos, 'good', regularly published, 10-12; mostly used for the folio, 11; their authority presumably analogous to that of texts first printed in the folio, 48; in some cases made use of their 'bad' predecessors, 62, 64².
- 'Queen Mother', 172.
- Queen of Corsica, The*, by F. Jaques, 23¹, 45.
- 'rabble', 126, 179; 'rabblement', 159.
- 'rash' = strike violently, xxxiv, 100, 182.
- Ravencroft, Edward, recorded tradition that *Titus* was the work of a 'private author' to which Shakespeare added 'some master touches', 118¹.
- reaction against eclecticism excessive, v, liv².
- readings: rejected readings generally thereby condemned as errors; xxxiv¹; difficulty of believing that some readings can be errors, xxxiv¹; readings of copy-text may need to be replaced by others, xxxv, or emended, xxxv¹; treatment of readings in revised reprints, xxxvii; readings of derivative editions, unless revised, of no authority, xlvii; possibility that readings in derivative editions may represent unrecorded corrections in substantive editions, l.

- recollection (or repetition) in reporting, 80, 83, 90, 93, 182.
- Red Bull company, restrained from acting Shakespeare's plays, 44¹.
- redundancy in reporting, 84, 90.
- reformation, *see* profanity.
- registration at Stationers' Hall: its absence no proof of piracy, 11; nature of the dramatic manuscripts submitted, 106.
- renaming of characters, in *Hamlet*, 66; in *M.W.W.*, 72, in *Hen. IV*, 132¹, in 2 *Hen. IV*, 115.
- repetition and parallelism a rhetorical trick, 90²; repetition in reporting, *see* recollection.
- reporter, favours descriptive stage directions, 36; his apparent knowledge of French in *Hen. V*, 69.
- reporting, involves a memorial stage, 9¹; alternative to first-draft theory, 9, 55; the main source of 'bad' quartos, 57; from memory, 59-60; by actors, in *M.W.W.*, 60, 71, in *Romeo*, 64, in *Hamlet*, 66, in *Hen. V*, 69; by the company in *Rich. III*, 85-6; by shorthand in *Lear*, 95; signs of, 80-1, 90.
- reports produced in the first instance for acting rather than printing, 59, 66, 70-2, 85.
- reprint made from defective copy and conjecturally restored, 118.
- reprints: generally excluded as copy-text, xiv; their progressive deterioration, xiv; may acquire substantive status through alteration, xiv, their character being modified through conflation with an independent source, xviii, or through revision, xix; minute supervision may render them substantive, xx; editorial treatment of sporadically revised reprints, xxxvii.
- restraint from acting Shakespeare's plays, 44¹.
- Revels, Master of the, licenser of plays, *see* Ashley, Buc, Herbert, Tilney.
- revised reprints, editorial treatment of, xxxvii.
- revision, dramatic: of *Believe as you List*, after refusal of licence, new manuscript prepared by the author, 32, 41; of *The Launching of the Mary* to meet censor's objections, 41; often assumed to be general and extensive, 40; on occasion of revival, 41; evidence of Henslowe and Herbert, 41; *Sir Thomas More* the classic example, 42; lack of evidence for literary or stylistic revision, 53, 61, 89; revision in connexion with 'bad' quartos, 61; possible revision subsequent to report, 53, 72; revision suggested in *Rich. III*, 77-8, in *Lear*, 88-9, in *Troilus*, 111, 114, in *Titus*, 118, in *M.N.D.*, 125, in *L.L.L.*, 127-8, in 1 *Hen. VI*, 139, in *Two Gent.*, 142, in *All's Well*, 146.
- revision, textual: may alter character of reprint, xix; by a second hand, editorial treatment, xx¹; not always distinguishable from correction, xx¹; not to be lightly assumed, xx¹; editorial treatment of substantial additions, xxxviii; distinction between substantial sporadic and minor pervasive, xxxviii; assumed to have been made in copy used for reprint, xxxix; only that by the author or derived from the playhouse has any authority, that of a literary tinker has none, xxxix; possible sources of genuine corrections, xxxix; distinction between sporadic and characteristic, xxxix²; when guaranteed by intrinsic character must be accepted, xl; paramount importance of source, and difficulty of determining it, xl-xli; authority of revision to be considered in relation to that of original, xliii; revision in a different line of descent, xliii²; comparable, so far as it goes, to a second substantive text, xlv; a mean authority to be generally allowed, xlv; editorial treatment of a text admittedly revised by the author, xlv; each correction to be taken from the earliest edition, xlv³; all revision in one edition not necessarily of one origin, xlv¹; external evidence of revision in editions of Shakespeare's plays, xlii¹; no evidence of revision by Shakespeare, though comparison with

- playhouse manuscripts in some cases probable, xliii.
- revival proved by actors' names, 41.
- Rhodes, Raymond Crompton, *Shakespeare's First Folio*, 40¹, 59, 96³, 107², 115¹, 134, 135¹, 149¹, 151¹; *The Early Editions of Sheridan*: I, 'The Duenna'; II, 'The School for Scandal' and *Some Aspects of Sheridan Bibliography* and ed. of Sheridan's Plays and Poems, 60.
- Richard II*, 120, 177; substantial addition in, xvi, xxxviii, xlii¹.
- Richard II, The First Part of the Reign of*, see *Thomas of Woodstock*.
- Richard III*, 77, 170; a mixed text with derivative passages, xvi, xviii, amounting to one seventh of the whole, xvii¹; choice of copy-text, xxiii; Q condemned as apparently a report, xxv, of authority not comparable with F, xxxii; errors of Q inherited by F, xxxiii, xlix; F suffers from purging of profanity, xxxii, and from one substantial omission, xxxvi; false claim of Q₃ to be 'augmented', xxiii¹, xlii¹.
- Richard III, The True Tragedy of*, 68, 81.
- rimes showing Shakespearian pronunciation, 94.
- Roberts, James, his entrances of *Hamlet*, 11¹, and *Troilus*, 112.
- Romeo and Juliet*, 61, 162; use made of 'bad' quarto by editors, 75; speakers' names in Q₂, 103; a lean Apothecary in, 116; Q₂ may be in part a mixed text or may contain derivative passages, xvi, is certainly contaminated, xvii², but rightly claims to be 'corrected', xlii¹.
- rough copy, see foul papers.
- Rowe, Nicholas, printed his edition of Shakespeare from the fourth folio, his claim to have consulted earlier editions, 4; credited Shakespeare with acting the Ghost in *Hamlet*, 32¹.
- Royal Slave, The*, by W. Cartwright, 23¹, 45.
- rules separating speeches in manuscript plays, 34.
- scene division, see act and scene division.
- scenes, added, 119; omitted, 70-1, 142; transposed, 67, 70-1.
- Schmidt, Alexander, held *Rich. III Q* and *Lear Q* to be reported texts, 79, 89; supposed all the quartos to be piracies, 89³; detected the use of Q₃ in *Rich. III F*, 87².
- Schücking, Levin L., *The Churchyard-Scene in Shakespeare's 'Hamlet'*, v. i, an Afterthought?, 68².
- 'Scilens' in 2 *Hen. IV* (cf. *Sir Thomas More*, D50, and *Shakespeare's Hand in Sir T. More*, p. 129), 115, 175.
- script, secretary and Italian, in prompt-books, 34.
- scroll read on the stage (cf. *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements*, p. 302), 69³.
- Second Maiden's Tragedy, The*, 23¹, 24-5, 28, 31, 35-6, 41.
- Segar, licensed plays in 1608-9 as deputy to Sir G. Buc, 106², 112¹.
- sermons published from reports by Charactery, 59.
- set stage with several localities in *Errors*, 140.
- Seven Deadly Sins, The*, the plot preserved at Dulwich College, 34, 45³.
- Shaaber, M. A., his edition of 2 *Hen. IV*, 182; and see M. W. Black.
- 'Shake-scene': Greene's attack on Shakespeare as an actor-dramatist, 50.
- sheet, of four folio pages, 28.
- Sheridan, Richard Brinsley, pirated versions of his plays, 60, 74, 135.
- Shirley, James, *The Court Secret*, q.v.
- shorthand, its suggested use in 'bad' quartos, 57-9, in *Rich. III*, 85, in *Lear* in spite of objections, 95-6, in addition to *Rich. II*, 121.
- Simpson, Percy, on the date of Jonson's revision of *Every Man in his Humour*, 42¹; his edition of Jonson, 151¹.
- Sincklo (or Sincler), John, an actor and an 'anatomy', 73¹, 116, 140¹, 161, 175.
- Sir John Oldcastle*, by Drayton, Hathway, Munday, and Wilson, 132; in the 1619 collection, 134².
- Sir John van Olden Barnavelte*, see *Barnavelte*.

- Sir Thomas More*, by A. Munday and others, 23¹, 24-5, 28, 33, 35, 43; exceptional and doubtful character of the manuscript, 42; Shakespeare's addition to, character of the writing, 29; textual tangle in, 103; line division in, liii.
- Sisson, Chares J., *Shakespeare Quartos as Prompt-Copies*, 182.
- Smart, J. S., *Shakespeare: Truth and Tradition*, his notes on *Hen. VI*, 52, and *A Shrew*, 73.
- Smith, D. Nichol, *Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century*, his remarks on Rowe's use of quartos and folios, 4¹.
- Soddered Citixen, The*, by J. Clavell (?), 23¹, 24-5, 45.
- songs indicated without text, 147, 170, (in Welsh) 181.
- source plays, 52, 55.
- Spanish Tragedy, The*, by T. Kyd, its publication, 12¹; parodied in *Hamlet* Q2 and echoed in Q1, 68; additions to, 119², xvi³, not by the author, xxxviii¹.
- speakers' names: in manuscripts, their form and position, usually in Italian script, sometimes added after text, 34; inconsistency of usage an indication of author's copy (McKerrow's theory), 103, in *Lear*, 100¹, in *Titus*, 119, 119³, in *L.L.L.*, 127-8, in *Errors*, 140; confusion between, in *Sir Thomas More*, 105, in *Humorous Day's Mirth*, 105¹, in *Rich. III*, 81¹, in *Titus*, 119, in *M. of V.*, 123, in *M.N.D.*, 125, in *K. John*, 142, in *L.L.L.*, 127-8.
- spectators' corrections in reprints, xl.
- speech rules, 34.
- speeches misassigned, in *Rich. III*, 85, in *Lear*, 94, in 2 *Hen. IV*, 115.
- speeches printed as stage directions, 61², 126.
- speeches reassigned, in 2 *Hen. IV*, 115², in *Titus*, 119.
- speeches without text (in Welsh), 181.
- spelling: that of original to be followed in a critical edition, xii; reasons for the practice, l-liv; spelling and pronunciation, li; period spelling, lii; record necessary for emendation and philological study, lii; old spelling not to be made a fetish, liv; possible traces of Shakespearian spelling in printed texts, 68, 113, 115, 123, 125, 140, 143, 147-8.
- Spenser, Edmund, rimes in *The Faery Queen* (I. III. xii. 8-9), li; spelling in *The Shepherd's Calendar*, lii.
- 'squeue', 'squiny' = squint, 100.
- stage directions: character of play-house directions in reprints, xli: in manuscripts, their position, 34, sometimes altered by book-keeper, 38, and even moved from verso to previous recto, 39; usually in Italian script, 34; types favoured by author, book-keeper, and reporter, 36, but these do not necessarily define the nature of the manuscript, 37; anticipation of entrances, 38, and warning of the same, 39; speeches misprinted as directions, 61¹: directions misprinted as text, 147, and as verse, 170; their absence in certain texts, 70, 136; derived from the source, 87; altered owing to act division, 119; omitted, 129; tense of, 151; illustrative selection in appendix, 158: see also individual plays *passim*.
- stage manager, acts as producer, 32¹.
- stage manuscripts, see individual plays *passim*.
- Stationers' Register, nature of the manuscripts presented for entrance, 106.
- Steevens, George, suggested Jonson as author of preface in the first folio, 154.
- Stenography, see J. Willis.
- stigmas of reporting, 81-4, 90-3.
- Stratford-on-Avon, Shakespeare's last days at, fantasies concerning, 157.
- Studies in the First Folio*, Shakespeare Association, 131², 134⁴, 154¹, 155².
- substantive and derivative editions, distinction between, xiii, may be quantitative, xv, sometimes difficult or conventional, even insignificant, xxi.
- substantive editions, may be so in their own right, being printed from manuscript, xiv, or through mixture, the character of a reprint being modi-

- fied from some other source, xv; if mixed, may be so through conflation, xviii, or through revision, xix; may contain derivative passages, xv, or be contaminated from an earlier print, xvii; the choice between them to be primarily on ground of origin and only secondarily literary, xxi-xxii; the mixed type unsatisfactory as copy-text, xxiv¹, but this objection not serious, lv.
- substantive passages in derivative editions, xvi; their editorial treatment, xxxviii.
- substitution, of passages in prompt-books, 41; of one character for another, 115.
- Suckling, Sir John, *Aglaura*, q.v.
- Taming of a Shrew, The*, its relation to *The Shrew*, 73-4.
- Taming of the Shrew, The*, 72, 168.
- tangles, see textual tangles.
- Tate, Nahum, *The History of King Lear, revived with alterations*, 1681, 4¹.
- Tawyer, William, 'Mr. Heminge's man' (St. Saviour's burials), 125, 180.
- Taylor, Joseph, of the King's men, acted in *Believe as you List*, 39; his dealings with Herbert, 135⁶.
- Tempest, The*, 151.
- text, there may be no definitive one to recover, ix; directions printed as, in *Macbeth*, 147; in *A Shrew*, 170; printed as directions, in *Romeo*, 61², in *M.N.D.*, 126, in *Hamlet*, 166.
- texts, inferior Shakespearian, vii; preserved in different versions, viii.
- textual data, analysis of, ix¹.
- textual derivation *versus* literary acceptability as criterion of authority, xxii, xxv.
- textual pessimism and optimism, vii, 17-18.
- textual purity of Shakespeare's plays, early solicitude for, xi¹.
- textual relationship, types of, xxiv.
- textual study, modern, its bibliographical character, 3.
- textual tangles, in foul papers, ix; in *Sir Thomas More*, 103; in *An Humorous Day's Mirth*, 105; in *Romeo*, 61²; in *Hamlet*, 65¹; in *Lear*, 100¹.
- textual variety in Shakespeare's plays, vii.
- theatrical poaching, 44.
- Thomas of Woodstock*, 23¹, 24-5, 34-5, 35¹.
- Tilney, Edmund, Master of the Revels, his refusal to license *Sir Thomas More*, 24, 42; *Cupid's Whirligig* entered as licensed by him, 106².
- Times Literary Supplement, The*, 43¹, 52, 56⁴, 73³, 131¹.
- Timon of Athens*, 149; possibly unfinished, viii, 182.
- Titus Andronicus*, 117, 176; substantive addition in F, xvi, xxxviii; alteration of directions consequent upon act division, xli³.
- transcript contaminated by recollection of performance, 65, 114.
- transposition in reports, verbal, 69, 81; of scenes, 67, 70-1.
- Troilus and Cressida*, 111, 174; texts perhaps of comparable authority, xxiv, showing conditions analogous to manuscripts, xxx¹; F possibly a mixed text, xx¹, conflated with an inferior manuscript, xxxix.
- True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York, The*, see 3 *Henry VI*.
- Twelfth Night or What you Will*, 144.
- Two Gentlemen of Verona, The*, 141.
- Two Noble Kinsmen, The*, its claim to inclusion in the canon, 17, 20; warning directions in, 39; textual features of, 152.
- Two Noble Ladies, The*, 23¹, 24-5, 33, 45.
- type ornaments in quartos, 127.
- Tyrwhitt, Thomas, assigned 2, 3 *Hen. VI* to Shakespeare, 50.
- unblotted papers, i.e. free from alteration and erasure, Shakespeare's and Fletcher's, 29; Heywood's in *The Captives*, 30.
- 'under the hand of' the Master of the Revels, 106; evidence that copy entered was the prompt-book, 107.
- un-Shakespearian passages, in *Macbeth*, 147, in *Cymb.*, 150.

- un-Shakespearian verse in 'bad' quartos, in *Romeo*, 63, in *Hamlet*, 67, 68¹, in *M.W.W.*, 71; none in *Hen. V*, 69.
- variation between copies of one edition, xlviii, 97; the forme the unit, editorial treatment of those in copy-text, those in other editions sometimes relevant, xlviii, whether in substantive or derivative editions, xlix; may sometimes be relevant to readings of derivative editions, l.
- verbal variants, synonymous, in *Rich. III*, 81; in *Lear*, 92; in *Troilus*, 112.
- verbal variants due to misreading, in *Othello*, 109; in 2 *Hen. IV*, 117.
- verse: printed as prose, 95; prose printed as verse, 69, 95, 170; verse and prose differently rendered by reporter, 69.
- 'Violanta', 144-5.
- 'Voltemand', forms of the name, possibly a perversion of Valdemar, 67.
- vulgarization in reporting, 84, 91, 182.
- Walker, Alice, v; on *M. of V.*, 133³; on *K. John*, 143¹.
- warnings of entries and stage business, 39, 152.
- Webster, John, his additions to Marston's *Malcontent*, xxxviii; resemblance to his style in the additions to *Titus* and *The Spanish Tragedy*, 119²; massed entries in *The Duchess of Malfy*, 137³.
- Welsh Ambassador, The*, 23¹, 24-5, 31, 39, 45.
- Whole Contention between Lancaster and York, The*, i.e. 2, 3 *Henry VI*, 131; text of 1619 revised, 132.
- Willis, John, *The Art of Stenography*, 1602, 57-8, 96.
- Willoughby, Edwin Elliott, on the first folio, 131¹.
- Wilson, F. P., v; on *Macbeth*, 147¹: *Ralph Crane, Scrivenor to the King's Players*, 25¹, 182; *The Jaggards and The First Folio of Shakespeare*, 131¹.
- Wilson, Jack, a singer in the King's company, 122.
- Wilson, John Dover, his assumption of wholesale revision, 40; on 'continuous copy' and the release of plays for press, 44; connects 'bad' quartos with the plague of 1592-3, 57; textual sections in the 'new' Cambridge Shakespeare, iii, 1, and introductions to facsimiles of texts from the folio, see individual plays *passim*; *The Manuscript of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet'*, xli3, 2¹, 32¹, 64², 68³, 79¹, 164; *The 'Stolne and Surreptitious' Shakespearian Texts*, with A. W. Pollard, 43¹; 'Bibliographical Links between the Three Pages and the Good Quartos' in *Shakespeare's Hand in the Play of 'Sir Thomas More'*, 683; *Spellings and Misprints in the Second Quarto of Hamlet*, 683; *The Task of Heminge and Condell*, 134; review of *A Game at Chess*, ed. Bald, 137³.
- Winter's Tale, The*, 150; the 'book' missing, 136.
- Witch, The*, by T. Middleton, 23¹, 45, 182; its connexion with *Macbeth*, 147.
- Wright, William Aldis, edited the Cambridge Shakespeare with W. G. Clark, 1; on the text of *M. of V.*, xxv¹.
- Yorkshire Tragedy, A*, in the collection of 1619, 131, 134².

PRINTED IN
GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE
UNIVERSITY PRESS
OXFORD
BY
JOHN JOHNSON
PRINTER
TO THE
UNIVERSITY

